

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



127 285

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

•

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

•

THE APOSTOLIC AGE
AND THE
NEW TESTAMENT

The Bohlen Lectures, 1935

By

GEORGE A. BARTON

PH.D., S.T.D., LL.D.

Professor of New Testament Literature and Language

Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia

Professor Emeritus of Semitic Languages

University of Pennsylvania

Philadelphia

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS

London: Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press

1936

To
the Memory of
My Beloved Colleague
GEORGE CADWALADER FOLEY, D.D.

FOREWORD

THE JOHN BOHLEN LECTURESHIP

JOHAN BOHLEN, who died in Philadelphia on the twenty-sixth day of April, 1874, bequeathed to trustees a fund of one hundred thousand dollars, to be distributed to religious and charitable objects in accordance with the well-known wishes of the testator.

By a deed of trust, executed June 2, 1875, the trustees under the will of Mr. Bohlen transferred and paid over to "The Rector, Church Wardens, and Vestrymen of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Philadelphia," in trust, a sum of money for certain designated purposes, out of which fund the sum of ten thousand dollars was set apart for the endowment of *The John Bohlen Lectureship*, upon the following terms and conditions:

"The money shall be invested in good substantial and safe securities, and held in trust for a fund to be called The John Bohlen Lectureship, and the income shall be applied annually to the payment of a qualified person, whether clergyman or layman, for the delivery and publication of at least one hundred copies of two or more lecture sermons. These lectures shall be delivered at such time and place, in the city of Philadelphia, as the persons nominated to appoint the lecturer shall from time to time determine,

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

giving at least six months' notice to the person appointed to deliver the same, when the same may conveniently be done, and in no case selecting the same person as lecturer a second time within a period of five years. The payment shall be made to said lecturer after the lectures have been printed and received by the trustees, of all the income for the year derived from said fund, after defraying the expense of printing the lectures and the other incidental expenses attending the same.

The subject of such lectures shall be such as is within the terms set forth in the will of the Rev. John Bampton, for the delivery of what are known as the "Bampton Lectures," at Oxford, or any other subject distinctly connected with or relating to the Christian Religion.

The lecturer shall be appointed annually in the month of May, or as soon thereafter as can conveniently be done, by the persons who for the time being shall hold the offices of Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese in which is the Church of the Holy Trinity, the Rector of said Church, the Professor of Biblical Learning, the Professor of Systematic Divinity, and the Professor of Ecclesiastical History, in the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia.

In case either of said offices are vacant, the others may nominate the lecturer."

Under this trust the Rev. George A. Barton, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., was appointed to deliver the lectures for the year 1935.

PREFACE

IT is not the purpose of the following pages to do more than to present an outline of the formative ideas and influences of the Apostolic Age, and their effect on the New Testament books produced in it, that shall be sufficiently brief and clear to be understood by the layman and non-technical scholar. The Bohlen lecturer must deliver his lectures. If he produces a technical treatise, as some lecturers have done, he speaks to almost empty benches. If he addresses such an audience as will come together to hear a general lecture, he cannot, in these days of technicalities, make a contribution to scholarship. As the writer preferred not to speak to empty benches, he chose to be an interpreter rather than a contributor to knowledge. The wide divergencies of opinion among New Testament scholars is, however, such that if one has any opinions at all, however undogmatically he may hold them, he cannot traverse the ground covered in the following pages and be true to himself without differing markedly from some of the other workers in the field. If it so happens that a writer has reached opinions based on genuinely scholarly grounds which make the New Testament documents and history fit into a coherent whole, and reaches that result without on the one hand claiming for New Testament writings exemption from

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

any ordinary just canons of criticism, or on the other denying to them such credibility as would naturally be accorded to any other equally ancient documents, that result may, perhaps, in the present chaos of thought, be in itself some tiny contribution to New Testament study.

It has seemed best in so unpretentious a volume to leave the lecture-form of presentation entirely unchanged.

GEORGE A. BARTON

CONTENTS

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
Foreword	vii
Preface	ix
Introduction	i
I. The Church Unconscious of its Mission	9
II. Missionary Efforts and Gospel Traditions	33
III. Christianity Encompasses the Ægean Sea	59
IV. The Passing of the Apostles	86
V. The Institutionalizing of Christianity	117
Chronology	147
Selected Bibliography	149
Index	155

INTRODUCTION

NO period of biblical history is so dear to the hearts of all Christians as the Apostolic Age. The years when those who had associated with Jesus and had been taught by him were passing on to others something of the faith and joy and power that the Master had imparted to them—were winning their converts, collecting and putting in order the Gospel traditions and were heroically meeting persecution—possess for us all an incomparable fascination and inspiration. We Christians believe that God had come to the world in Jesus Christ in a unique way; and how the men who had actually touched his hand and heard the accents of his voice lived and acted afterward, not only arouses our curiosity, but contains the seeds of instruction as to what our life may become. It is, therefore, not only with the delight of children in a tale that transcends the normal course of human life and abounds in wonders, but with the wistful interest of those who would find the way of life and of happiness, that we turn back to the familiar, yet unfamiliar story of how a handful of Galilean fishermen started a mission that ultimately conquered the world's proudest empire. The story is familiar, because we have all been instructed in the Acts of the Apostles and in the New Testament Epistles, and yet it is unfamiliar, because those books give

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

us no picture at all of the years between 64 and 100 A. D., and for the period between the years 30 and 64 they leave many gaps in our knowledge. Further, the researches of Christian scholars, which have been pursued indefatigably for a hundred and fifty years—studies which have gathered and are gathering new information from the criticism of the text, the so-called historical or higher criticism, and from such light as can be obtained from non-Christian sources—are always supplying some new detail here and there which throws a part of the story into new perspective. It is for this reason that the Bohlen lecturer should make some fresh excursions into the Apostolic Age, to try to ascertain what new light has been thrown by recent investigations upon parts of Apostolic history. It is only fair to warn the reader at the start that scholars are by no means agreed as to how all the facts are to be interpreted. Perhaps even in the millennium not all of God's people will see eye to eye. The lecturer is, however, not a dogmatist. He tries to be an impartial witness, distinguishing between established facts and mere opinions. On many controverted points he holds definite opinions and will not hesitate to state them, but in such cases he will not leave the reader in doubt as to whether he is uttering a personal opinion or stating a view in which scholars generally concur.

Within the last sixteen years a new method of studying the Gospels, known as "form-criticism" (in German *Formgeschichte*) has been devised. Its purpose is not to deal with the documents which underlie the Gospels, but to study that which shaped the oral traditions of which such documents are the record. The assumption of the

INTRODUCTION

founders of this type of criticism is that the traditions were not only gathered to meet certain ecclesiastical or community needs, but were shaped in part by those needs and in part by influences which shape all popular sagas. Two eminent exponents of form-criticism, Dibelius¹ and Bultmann,² go so far as to assume that many of the traditions of the doings, sayings, and experiences of Jesus were invented by Christian communities. An excellent example of this type of reasoning is Dibelius' article "Gethsemane," translated by Enslin.³ The kernel of the argument in this article may be stated thus: Most of the disciples in Gethsemane were too far distant from Jesus to hear what he said or to know what he did. Peter, James, and John, whom he took with him, according to Mark's own account (and it is St. Mark's account that is made the basis of the study) fell asleep; they accordingly could not have known what Jesus said when he prayed. Further, the fact that the record gives only the words uttered by Jesus when he prayed the first time and no words of his second and third prayers are reported, is held to show that no one knew what he said in any of the prayers, and that the words of the first prayer are an invention. Because the disciples were either asleep or too distant to know what happened, the whole story must be an invention. But why was it invented? Prophecy had foretold that the Messiah must suffer. Suffering on the part

¹ Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, London (trans.), 1934.

² R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 1921, 2nd. ed., 1931; *Jesus*, 1925; *Die Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien*, 2nd. ed., 1930; *Jesus and the Word*, 1934. Cf. also F. C. Grant, *Form Criticism*, 1934.

³ Published in *The Crozer Quarterly*, XII (July, 1935), 254-265.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

of Jesus, therefore, so far from disproving his messiahship, was needed to establish it. Hence it is evident that the story of the suffering of Jesus in Gethsemane is an invention of the early Christian community for purposes of apologetic.

In that argument there are two fatal weaknesses. In Mark 14:51, 52, mention is made of a "certain young man" who was loitering in Gethsemane that night, and who, when Jesus was arrested, only escaped by losing his outside garment. A far stronger case can be made out for the supposition that that young man was Mark himself than can be made out for the supposition that this whole story is a pure invention. But even if the young man were not St. Mark, it is certain that he was someone sufficiently interested in Jesus to risk his neck for the sake of being near him and knowing what happened to him. Such a man would be sure to be near enough to hear what Jesus said. Even if no disciples witnessed the agony, therefore, tradition had no need to invent it. Again, if to prove Jesus' messiahship suffering were needed, the crucifixion was an undeniable and a well-known fact. There was, accordingly, no ground on this score for the community to invent the scene in Gethsemane.

The type of argument represented in this article vitiates much of the work of Dibelius and Bultmann. It is the product of temperaments that are so sceptical about everything in the Bible that they demand of it standards of certainty that would not be required in any other book. This temper is not confined to form-criticism; it has long pervaded a certain school of literary and historical

INTRODUCTION

criticism. A good example of it in this larger field is Windisch's "Case against the Tradition" (the tradition in the Acts of the Apostles) in Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake's *Beginnings of Christianity*, II, 298-348. Windisch there sets up standards of consistency and accuracy to be fulfilled before historical credence can be accorded, that would condemn his own writing and that of most modern scholars. If such standards of consistency were to be demanded for the future, the record of a certain prominent American politician from June 1932 to November 1935 would never in the future be credited as more historical than *Gulliver's Travels*!

The sceptical and, in my judgment, imperfect reasoning of critics like Dibelius and Bultmann has so impressed Robert Henry Lightfoot, the Bampton Lecturer for 1934, that he concludes that the Gospels afford us little more than a whisper of the voice of Jesus.⁴ This sceptical use of form-criticism is an abuse of it. Rightly employed, it is a most valuable instrument. In the hands of less sceptical and more reasonable critics, such as Burton Scott Easton⁵ and Vincent Taylor,⁶ it has yielded most substantial and useful results. It is, however, a tool which is mainly useful, when studying the Gospels, in helping us to understand the conditions which led to the recalling of a saying of Jesus or an incident in his life, its preservation, or the epoch during which it was embodied in a document or in one of our present Gospels. It seldom is adequate to

⁴ R. H. Lightfoot, *History and Interpretation of the Gospels*, 1934.

⁵ B. S. Easton, *The Gospel before the Gospels*, 1928; *Christ in the Gospels*, 1930.

⁶ V. Taylor, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, 1933.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

prove that the Christian community had the genius to invent the incidents outright which they record. To such incidents they doubtless at times gave their own coloring or added their own explanations. The exigencies of their life and work may explain why they recalled them at all, but I am convinced by my own studies through more than forty-five years that it requires more credulity, in most cases, to believe that the community invented the incidents than it does to believe that they go back to the unique Master.

In reality form-criticism is a modern and, when rightly used, a legitimate form of the "tendency-criticism" which F. C. Baur invented a century ago, and the tendencies which it detects are not at all fanciful. It simply builds upon the fact that all religious literature, whether oral tradition or literary product, has a motive and reflects in one way or another the aspirations, problems, atmosphere, or controlling ideas under which it was produced. Personally I have found the recognition of these facts illuminating not only for the study of the Gospels, but for the whole field of New Testament research.

Prolonged study of the Apostolic Age has convinced me that its history falls into three distinct periods, during each of which, so far as our New Testament literature is concerned, different problems had to be faced, different questions agitated the minds of the leaders, and different influences are reflected in the literature. The first of these began with the Day of Pentecost in the year 30 A. D. and extended to the beginning of St. Paul's mission in Antioch in 42 or 43 A. D. We might call it the period when the Church was groping for its mission. During this period

INTRODUCTION

the effort of the leaders was to convince Jews that Jesus was the Messiah, and the net result of their labors was to establish Christianity as a small Jewish sect.

The second period began with St. Paul's coming to Antioch in 42 or 43 A. D. and ended with his death in the year 64 A. D., or, more conveniently, with the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A. D. The question to the fore in this period was: Is Christianity a Jewish sect, or a universal religion? This is the period of the beginning of conscious missionary enterprise. It is characterized by fierce controversy between the universalists and the particularists. The result was the spread of Christianity through Asia Minor, around the Ægean, to the islands of the Mediterranean, to Rome, and, perhaps, to Alexandria.

The third period begins at 70 A. D. and extends to the composition of the last book of the Canon about 150 A. D. During this period Christians had to face the problems created by syncretistic thought in the form of gnosticism, open opposition of the Jews, the insidious competition of the mystery religions, and, because no longer a Jewish sect, the persecution visited upon an illegal religion by Roman government. This was the period of the institutionalizing of Christianity.

Each of these periods left its mark on the literature or traditions produced in it, and the recognition of these three stages of the history becomes a helpful instrument of criticism. It should, however, be borne in mind that in each period there were forces at work preparing for the one next to follow. Thus in the first period, as I shall try to show, not only the convictions of Saul of Tarsus, but the abounding enthusiasm of Christians not

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

of Apostolic rank prepared the way, often to the amazement and embarrassment of the Apostles, for the mission work of the next period. Similarly, St. Paul's arguments and similes, employed during the second period to heal violent party spirit and to prevent schism in Christian congregations, became the foundation in the third period for the doctrine of the Church.

It must not be supposed, however, that the influences named constituted all the controlling ideas of the different periods. In the discussion which is to follow many others will be mentioned in such detail as the conditions of a lecture permit. I trust, however, that to those who are patient enough to follow me in this excursion through New Testament history, the outline given may prove a kind of Ariadne-clue, if details become perplexing.

I

THE CHURCH UNCONSCIOUS OF ITS MISSION

I

THE activities of the Apostolic Age began with the Day of Pentecost, a day signalized by such an unusual experience that its marvels constitute the initial wonder of early Christianity's extraordinary career. With the account of the Day of Pentecost as recorded in the second chapter of the Book of Acts, we are all familiar. Probably, too, we all think we know what happened then until we begin to look below the surface of the story and ask it some searching questions. We have the impression that the house where the one hundred and twenty disciples of Jesus were assembled was filled with a great wind, cloven tongues as of fire appeared on the head of each, and all were supernaturally given the power of speaking foreign languages. Whittier sums up in poetry the popular impression, when he writes:

Not on one sacred forehead fell
Of old the fire-tongued miracle,
But flamed o'er all the thronging host
The Baptism of the Holy Ghost.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

Poetry kindles the imagination and reveals ideal values, but a realistic age asks for fact, and a faith which makes the proud boast that it is founded on facts cannot well ignore the question. When we begin to ascertain what the nature of the Pentecostal phenomenon was, the attention is arrested by the phrase (Acts 2:4) "They began to speak with other tongues" (*ἐτέραις γλώσσαις*)—a phrase practically identical with one (*ἐτερογλώσσοις*) which St. Paul, quoting from the Septuagint of Isa. 28:11, applies in 1 Cor. 14:21 to the speaking with tongues at Corinth. In the context immediately preceding this Old Testament quotation, St. Paul makes it clear that the "other tongues" to which he referred were the ejaculation of people in ecstasy. The subject falls in unconsciousness or in semi-unconsciousness, and ejaculates, he knows not what. As St. Paul puts it, the spirit speaks, but the understanding is unfruitful. That this is what happened on the Day of Pentecost is further confirmed by the fact that mockers said, "They are full of new wine." Had they been standing on their feet and speaking foreign languages, there would have been no point in the charge, but to men lying in a semi-unconscious state and uttering ejaculations, the suspicion was appropriate. Among most early peoples ecstasy was regarded as the product of possession by a supernatural spirit. The ejaculations of the subject were regarded as oracles. Such were the beginnings of prophecy in ancient Israel (see, e. g., 1 Sam. 19:18-24), and, as it will appear in the sequel, it was just this conception, still entertained by the Jews and their contemporaries, which gave Pentecost its significance to the early Christians.

The significant event of Pentecost was, then, a group

DAY OF PENTECOST

mystic experience, kindred to that experienced by other congregations, including not a few in modern times, in which some fall into ecstasy and ejaculate broken sentences. Students of such psychic phenomena tell us that such group experiences are sometimes, when intense, accompanied by what seems like rushing draughts of air and by auras about the heads of the assembly. If such phenomena are described by the Book of Acts as a "rushing mighty wind" and as "tongues parting asunder like as of fire," it is no more of an exaggeration than its statement that there were in Jerusalem "Jews, devout men, from every nation under heaven," when but sixteen countries can be named. We conclude, then, that the sensation of Pentecost was a group mystic experience, in which some fell into ecstasy. That St. Peter did not experience it is clear from the fact that he was able to stand on his feet and preach, and the statement that he stood up "with the eleven" implies that the ecstasy was not shared by any of the twelve Apostles.

But if our interpretation is correct, did the author of the Acts so understand it? Did he not intend to imply that the spirit-filled Christians were miraculously speaking foreign languages which they had never learned? That view was held by many and doubtless still is. Friedrich Spitta¹ forty years ago believed that there were woven into the second chapter of the Acts two documents, the older of which recognized the truly ecstatic nature of the Pentecostal experience, but the younger of which mistook it for the ability to speak foreign tongues. Kirsopp Lake recognizes, however, that the phrase, "how do we hear them each one in our own language," implies a miracle of hearing as well

¹ *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Halle, 1891, pp. 22-44, 322, and 355.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

as a miracle of speaking, but, not recognizing the actual phenomena described, he thinks "the details of the situation are obscure."²

I venture to think that neither of these views is right. The Acts gives us, I believe, a simple and straightforward narrative of what actually happened. Let us imagine ourselves present at such a scene. Suppose one in ecstasy utters the syllable *bad*. An Englishman, hearing it would understand it to mean "not good"; a German would understand it to mean "a bath"; a Hebrew, "a part" or "portion"; an ancient Sumerian would understand it to mean either "a wall" or the verb "open," according to the pitch at which it was pronounced; an Arab, imagining a peculiar guttural sound with the *a*, might understand it to mean "afterward"; while a Frenchman, if he understood the *d* as a *t*, might take it to mean "a pack-saddle." In other words, many syllabic sounds have some, though different, meanings in many tongues.³ Ecstatic utterances were, as the fourteenth chapter of First Corinthians shows, matters of interpretation. When, therefore, the author of the Acts says, "We hear them each in our own language" he was, I believe, giving a simple description of the impression which the ecstatic utterances made upon the listeners. It is our modern unfamiliarity with the ancient technical meaning of "other tongues" which has put us on the wrong track and led us astray.

What happened, then, at Pentecost was that the little Christian company were united in a highly emotional group mystic experience. As a consequence a number of them

² *Beginnings of Christianity*, V, 112.

³ Cf. the writer's *Christ and Evolution*, p. 106 n.

DAY OF PENTECOST

fell into ecstasy and gave voice to ejaculations such as were, in ancient times, regarded as utterances of the Spirit. Similar experiences, though probably of less intensity, have been had at many later periods of Christian history, and may still be witnessed occasionally at camp meetings and revivals among people of backward education. The experience of the Day of Pentecost produced the effect that it did because of its peculiar setting and the circumstances and the background of the group then assembled.

It has already been noted that in the days of King Saul prophets spoke in ecstasy. That was true of the greater number of Hebrew prophets down to and including Elisha. In this period such people were organized into guilds and were called "sons of the prophets," the Hebrew technical term for a prophetic guild. Such prophets employed music at times as a means of inducing the prophetic ecstasy. An instance in the person of Elisha is recorded (2 Kings 3:15). It was during this period that the oldest document of the Pentateuch was written. In it God is represented as very familiar with men; he came to favored ones in human form and talked with them. As the centuries passed and Israel experienced the historic tragedies which, from the pages of the Bible we all know so well, this sense of the nearness of God was lost. The great literary prophets discarded ecstasy and spoke from enlightened insight. Finally, about two hundred years before Pentecost, God was thought to have ceased to speak even in that way. The day of prophecy was over. God, who had been so familiar in the olden time and who had given the law, was now silent. Until the Messiah came, all God's people could do was to study, interpret, and live by his law. The prophet Joel had predicted (Joel

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

2:28) a day when God's spirit would be again poured out and not a few, both men and women, would again prophesy and see visions. To that day the devout in Judah were looking forward. Just as Christians look back to the Apostolic Age as to the pattern of what Christian life should be, so Jews looked back to the time when Moses spake with God face to face, when prophetic ecstasies and visions were common, and when men were full of courage and enthusiasm because of the consciousness of the manifest presence of God.

Further, the little group that gathered on that Pentecostal day were in a highly emotional and expectant state. Only a little while before, their hopes had been raised to a great height by the belief that Jesus was the Messiah and would at once establish the kingdom of God. Then they were reduced to the depths of despair by his crucifixion. Soon again hope was revived by the visions of the risen Christ experienced by a number of them. With expectations raised to a high pitch by all this, and with emotions shaken from their normal insensitive calm, they were prepared to interpret this group mystic experience in the light of ancient Hebrew history and of the Messianic hope. The ecstasy and the "speaking with tongues" was to them ocular evidence that the days of Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha had returned. Joel's prophecy was now in process of fulfillment. Here was ocular and audible evidence that Jesus was the Messiah and that the Messianic Age had actually begun. Whereas they had formerly felt like the Russian peasants in the days of the empire who used to say, "God is in heaven and the emperor far away," now they knew that God was near to empower, to protect, to guide, to lead to

DAY OF PENTECOST

triumph. Had they been enabled merely to speak foreign languages, this result would not have been produced. There was no record in their history that a prophet ever spoke a foreign tongue because of his prophetic inspiration. No association of ideas would have led them to interpret the sudden acquisition of such an ability as the assurance that the age of the Messiah was beginning. They believed, however, as their Scripture taught, that prophecy had been born in ecstasy, and the ecstasies which they witnessed were to them evidence that prophecy was having a new birth before their eyes, and that God was really with them. To us who have long misinterpreted the first part of the second chapter of the Acts, and who have learned to look askance at this type of ecstasy as excessive and unhealthy emotionalism, it may seem an unwelcome disillusionment to learn the truth, but these disciples lived in an earlier time and had a background different from ours, and God gave them just what they needed then for the creation of that vital faith, necessary to the work before them. Equipped with this faith, they went forth to convince the world that Jesus was the Messiah. That God was with them in a new and creative way, they never doubted again. The gift of Pentecost, the miracle of ecstatic tongues, was given them once and again to renew their faith ⁴ and, as the years passed, they experienced the fruits of the Spirit in many other ways. Out of this experience of the constant fellowship of the Spirit there came at length the Christian belief that the Holy Spirit, together with the Father and the Son, is a "Person" of the Trinity. Faith in the nearness of God and the presence of his Spirit, witnessing to the Messiahship

See Acts 8:17; 10:44-46; 19:6; and 1 Cor. 14.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

of Jesus, as well as giving them guidance, thus became the first and most powerful of the formative influences of the Apostolic Age.

II

Were we not so familiar with the Book of Acts, it would surely strike us as strange that Pentecost was not immediately followed by missionary activities. The word "apostle" means "missionary" and we trace the missionary enterprises which resulted in the historic Church back to Apostles, but apparently it did not dawn on those who shared the Pentecostal experience and the Pentecostal faith, that they had any duty in this regard. Their Master had sent some of them, as a part of their training, to preach to Jews, and on the Day of Pentecost Jews from thirteen different countries (so Acts 2:10, 11 informs us) had heard St. Peter's preaching. Some of these at least, as we shall later see, accepted Jesus as the Messiah and carried Christianity to their distant homes. With this the first Christians appear to have been satisfied. They settled down in Jerusalem to live as a sect within Judaism. They attended the morning and evening sacrifices in the temple faithfully, they lived a life of simple communism such as Jesus had led with the Twelve during his ministry, they broke bread "from house to house," eating their food "with gladness and singleness of heart," and awaited Christ's miraculous return to establish his kingdom. Their communism was not compulsory, but voluntary, and apparently lasted only five or six months, from the end of May until perhaps November of the year 30, when it was rudely interrupted by a persecution led by Saul of Tarsus.

COMMUNISTIC EXPERIMENT

The record of this communistic experiment is interesting and instructive. In the Jerusalem of the first century, as in the Jerusalem of today, there were resident many Jews who had been born abroad in other countries—whose ancestors had lived in other lands for generations. Then, as now, pious Jews of the Dispersion went to Jerusalem to spend their last days and to be buried in the sacred soil of their fathers. To these the Aramaic tongue spoken in Jerusalem was a foreign language. Probably a majority of these Jewish outlanders spoke Greek. At a great festival, like that of Pentecost, the number of non-Palestinian Jews was augmented by hundreds of pilgrims. On the Day of Pentecost a considerable number of these Greek-speaking Jews had been won to Christianity. A goodly number of these formed a part of the Christian communistic community. Palestinian, Aramaic-speaking, Pharisaical Jews regarded themselves as superior to those who lived among heathen, spoke another tongue, and were under suspicion of being a little lax in keeping the sacred Law. Then, as now, superiority complexes were resented. Even the Spirit-baptized Christian community was human enough to share these very natural feelings. The funds of the community were in the hands of the Apostles. They day by day gave out the doles according as they understood the individual needs, but these natural antipathies and suspicions threw an apple of discord into this Christian communistic paradise. "There arose a murmuring of the Grecian Jews (Hellenists) against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily administration." How natural and how modern! Labor today does not trust an administrative board constituted of capitalists, and the reverse is even more true.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

Even in the Church one finds the same spirit manifested. On this occasion, however, the Apostles displayed a degree of Christian magnanimity worthy of their Master. They proposed to their complaining critics that they choose seven good Christian men whom they could trust, and to these they promised that the whole financial administration should be turned over. Upon this the Hellenists proceeded to choose seven men, all of their own party, and the Apostles, true to their promise, committed the whole financial matter of supplies and their distribution to them. It was a most Christian act. Can we imagine one party in any modern Church voluntarily turning all the money of the organization over to its opponents and critics?

The purchase and distribution of food was called "service" (*diakonia*), so these seven men were called "servants" (*diakonoi*). It thus happened that, as a result of the natural suspicions of Hellenists and the unwonted magnanimity of the Apostles, the Christian order of Deacons was born—the oldest of all our ecclesiastical orders. True, at the beginning the functions of this order were not what they later became, but what is there in this evolving world that does not undergo evolution?

These first deacons did not all of them confine themselves to the management of the commissariat. One of them, Stephen, became prominent almost immediately as a propagandist of the new faith. It was customary for the Jews who had migrated to Jerusalem from any country to maintain in the Holy City a synagogue, which formed a kind of religious and social center for them. Just as today the Germans or Italians in our American cities tend to form settlements of their own and to maintain certain associa-

COMMUNISTIC EXPERIMENT

tions in common, so in Jerusalem Jewish freedmen from Rome, Jewish settlers from Cyrene in North Africa, from Alexandria, from Cilicia, and the Province of Asia, and many others, maintained their own community synagogues, where they met to study the law and for other community purposes. In or near these centers, too, they maintained hostels for the accommodation of pilgrims who might come at festal or other times from their respective countries. Into these synagogues Stephen went and endeavored to persuade those whom he found there that Jesus was their long expected Messiah, and that they should become Christians. Although it is not expressly stated in the Book of Acts, it is clear from its account that in the synagogue of the Cilicians he encountered a young man from Tarsus named Saul, who took particular exception to his teaching, who thought he saw how contrary it all was to Judaism and that, if it was allowed to spread, it would be subversive of the religion of their fathers. It was probably due to the logic of this young man that others were inflamed so that Stephen was haled before the Sanhedrin, and that august Jewish court was finally so exasperated that they committed an act of mob violence by dragging Stephen out and stoning him—an act which, under Roman rule, they had no right to perform. The martyrdom of Stephen brought this young Saul into prominence in the story of early Christianity, a prominence which he maintains throughout the pages of the Acts of the Apostles. If we would understand our New Testament it is necessary, therefore, to pause and endeavor to reconstruct the workings of the mind of this young Jew from Tarsus, and endeavor to ascertain what made him act as he did, for the key to his violent activities near the close of the year

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

30 will prove to be the key to his whole future thought and career.

III

To those who have eyes to see, there are autobiographical notes in St. Paul's Epistles which enable us to reconstruct his thought. The key which at the present moment we seek is found in Galatians 3:13, where we read, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us: as it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Most interpreters, failing to apply the exegetical maxim, "Interpret the abstract by the concrete, the obscure by the clear," have missed the point of this verse altogether, and have speculated as to how Christ the Son of God, because the sins of the world rested upon him, could become a curse in the sight of God. That St. Paul had no such thought as this in mind, he makes clear to the careful interpreter by the somewhat inexact quotation from Deut. 21:22, 23 of the phrase, "He that is hanged is cursed of God." The law of Deuteronomy at this point provides that, if a man commit a crime and is hung on a tree (or on wood), his body shall not be allowed to remain hanging over night, that the land may not be defiled, for he that is hanged is cursed of God. To Saul of Tarsus that law was God's inspired word; he took it literally, every word of it. Jesus had been hung on a cross—on wood. Saul had God's word that "He that is hanged is cursed of God." Saul was, however, more than a literalist; he was a man of imagination. Jesus had been buried the same day that he was crucified, it is true; but he had claimed to be the Messiah, the Sanhedrin had convicted him of blasphemy, the Roman gov-

WHY SAUL PERSECUTED

error had at their request crucified him; but here were men who declared that this crucified man, cursed of God's law, was risen from the dead, and they were proclaiming that this man, so cursed, was still to rule as Messiah. With such thoughts in his mind, Saul reasoned that the curse which rested on the crucified was, by the spread of the Christian heresy, actually extending to the Jewish land and the Jewish people. His was the logical mind, trained in rabbinic reasoning to think the thing through from the rabbinic point of view, and his the ardent youthful zeal to act with vigor in the premises. His initial activity appears to have been the accomplishment of the stoning of Stephen. Probably he had encountered him and debated with him in the synagogue of the Cilicians at Jerusalem. It may have been this encounter which first awakened his mind to the full significance of the Nazarene heresy. This is suggested by the fact that the witnesses of the stoning of Stephen "laid down their garments at the feet of a young man named Saul." Following the death of Stephen, the persecution of the Christians waxed hot. Saul, securing authority from the Sanhedrin, haled Christian men and women to prison. As a result Christians (at least many of them) fled Jerusalem for their lives. The community was scattered abroad; the communistic experiment was at an end.

IV

According to Acts 8:2, when the majority of the Christians fled from Jerusalem because of this persecution, the Apostles did not flee. They remained there and stood their ground. St. Luke tells us (Acts 8:2) "They therefore that

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

were scattered abroad went about preaching the word." It was thus that the Christian mission for the winning of the world for Christ was begun. It was not inaugurated because of Apostolic planning, nor because the Apostles knew that they had a mission from their Master to win the world; it was inaugurated by the enthusiasm of the rank and file of common Christians, who, by ruthless persecution, had been driven from the communistic nest in which the Apostles had established them. The Apostles were content to wait at Jerusalem for the physical return of Christ to inaugurate a miraculous cataclysm. They expected him to do by miracle what, as we can now see, God expects Christians to accomplish by following in the footsteps of their Master: to win the world by preaching, suffering, and martyrdom. In the Providence of God the rude hand of Saul of Tarsus, and the abounding love of Christ in the hearts of common, unnamed Christians, set the Church on the right way in spite of Apostolic lethargy and lack of insight.

Of those who thus began the Christian mission, St. Luke tells the story of only one, Philip the deacon and evangelist. Probably this is the only one of these missionary stories which St. Luke knew in detail, and he learned this at first hand. Nearly thirty years later he was a guest at the house of Philip in Caesarea (Acts 21:8-10), and doubtless talked with him and his daughters of these earlier days. St. Luke records (Acts 8) how Philip established a Church in Samaria, won a convert from far-off Ethiopia (Nubia), and preached in other cities of the coastal plain of Palestine. As we later find churches at Lydda, Joppa, and Caesarea, it is probable that they were established by the pioneering work of Philip. Thus at the beginning Philip, a mere deacon

CONVERSION OF SAUL

like Stephen, outdid the Apostles in missionary labor and zeal.

V

Meantime Saul of Tarsus, having interrupted the activities of the Jerusalem Church and driven its members into hiding, obtained a commission from the Sanhedrin to go to Damascus to search for Christians, and to bring any that he might find to Jerusalem for trial. Did it ever occur to you to inquire why there should be Christians in Damascus at this early date, or why Saul should suspect that there were Christians there? Why, of all cities, should he select Damascus? Some documents found in the Genizeh Synagogue at Cairo some years ago and published by the late Solomon Schechter may perhaps suggest the answer. There had been in Damascus for some time a sect of Zadokites, who were especially interested in the coming of the Messiah. Some of Dr. Schechter's documents contain their teachings. Damascus was at this time in the possession of the Nabathæan king of Petra, Aretas, or Haretat—a kingdom which was called by people of the Roman Empire, Arabia. Among the Jews present in Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost there were Jews from Arabia, the kingdom of Aretas, and doubtless a part of them were Zadokites from Damascus. The Zadokites were zealous for righteousness as well as for the Messiah, and probably some of them had become Christians before they returned home. In this way these fragments from an old book-room in Cairo help us to understand how the way was prepared for the Christian message to be eagerly welcomed in the city of that ancient oasis on the border of the Arabian Desert.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

To Damascus, then, Saul of Tarsus took his way. The journey of a hundred and sixty miles was then an undertaking. Now it can be accomplished by motor between sunrise and sunset, but then, on the back of a plodding beast, it was a matter of at least four days. During those days of quiet riding this man of Tarsus had time to think, and if we would understand what took place just before he reached his destination, we must pause to look into his heart and to reconstruct the workings of his mind. Saul had been all his life an exceedingly earnest, religious man, possessed of an unusual ethical sincerity. He was a man who could not tolerate a sham even in himself—a statement that would be untrue of most of us. He is reported to have said to the Jewish Sanhedrin (Acts 23:1) “I have lived before God in all good conscience until this day,” and the statement is entirely credible. We know from his letter to the Romans, however (ch. 7:7-24), that at the time of this journey his conscience was not at rest. We have seen that he was a Jewish fundamentalist (to apply to him a term of the present day) and that he was sincerely trying to keep the law, but he was far from happy, because he knew he was not successful. He found one commandment that he could not keep: “Thou shalt not covet.” To all the outward commands he could conform, but to save his soul he could not control the wanderings of desire. He read in Deuteronomy (27:26) how God’s curse was pronounced upon all those who did not continue in all the things written in the law to do them, and, conscious of his inability not to covet, he was extremely unhappy. “O wretched I,” his soul was crying, “who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?” “When I would do good, evil is present with me.” Only a few days before,

CONVERSION OF SAUL

or at the most a very few weeks, he had witnessed the radiantly triumphant death of Stephen. He had seen his shining face and had heard his dying prayer: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," and "Lay not this sin to their charge." The memory came back to him in contrast to the agony of his own failure and the uncertainty of his own salvation. Stephen had apparently found the secret for which he himself was seeking. What if, after all, the crucified Jesus were the promised Messiah?

Pondering such things as these, as he approached Damascus he experienced that vision which is described three times in the Book of Acts, and to which St. Paul alludes more than once in his Epistles. Just how much of the language in which the vision is described is to be taken literally, and how much figuratively, we may not be able to determine, but Saul of Tarsus was ever after absolutely certain that the risen Christ had appeared to him and had spoken to him in an epiphany just as real as any experienced by others in the days that followed the first Easter. This vision greatly developed his thinking, and changed his whole inner experience. We have already seen how his reasoning concerning the curse on one who had hung on a tree had made him a persecutor. Now he was convinced by his own experience that God had raised from the dead that man whom God through his law had so cursed. That was an honor greater than God had bestowed on any other. The Scriptures told how Enoch and Elijah had been translated, but no saint of old had been raised from the dead. Here was a new and unparalleled manifestation of God's favor, and that God made such manifestations to the unworthy, Saul could not believe. Jesus had claimed to be the Messiah, accordingly

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

the Messiah he must be; his resurrection proved him such (cf. Rom. 1:3, 4).

Further, if God permitted the curse of the law to rest on his Messiah in his death and then raised him to life again, he must have had some great purpose in so doing. To Saul, as to every faithful Jew, the law had been the one and only divinely appointed way to God and life. In that way every Jew must walk; into that way every Gentile must come as a proselyte, if he would attain life. To Saul's logical mind, as he pondered upon it, it appeared that, by raising Jesus from the dead while the curse of the law rested upon him, God had freed him from that curse and had broken through the hedge of the law. Whereas he had previously reasoned that those who identified themselves with Jesus shared his curse, he now reasoned that such shared Jesus' freedom from the law's curse. Thus, as he says in Romans 3:25, God had set Christ forth as "a mercy seat" (for so *hilasterion* should be translated). This mercy seat was "apart from the law" (Rom. 3:21), and those who came to it found a righteousness possible that was indeed of God. Saul himself felt that his faith in Jesus had connected him with a new source of power. He could now reasonably achieve his ideals. It was no longer, "When I would do good evil is present with me," but "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. 8:2).

The death and resurrection of Jesus under these circumstances, and the opening thereby of this "mercy seat" freed forever, so Saul thought, both Jew and Gentile from any religious obligation to keep the law. Men were counted righteous in God's sight, not because they kept the law, but

CONVERSION OF SAUL

because they had faith in Jesus Christ and had, at his mercy seat, obtained God's forgiveness. Thus the "wall of partition" that had separated Jew and Gentile was broken down. It thus happened that his vision near Damascus did four things for Saul of Tarsus. It convinced him that Jesus was the Messiah. It established a new spiritual law in his being, united his warring personality, and gave him peace. It gave him his gospel of salvation by faith. It made him the Apostle to the Gentiles. All this grew out of his literalistic, rabbinic, first-century point of view, which some regard as so crude that they are unwilling to admit that he held it.⁵

We should here pause to point out that St. Paul's theory as to how the death of Christ is connected with the forgiveness of sins centers in the cross and not in the altar. In all his Epistles that are genuine (Ephesians is not now regarded as his), there is but one passage where Christ is spoken of as a sacrifice (see 1 Cor. 5:7), and there he is alluded to as the paschal lamb. It was to St. Paul only a passing figure, because he was writing near the time of the Passover. It is the gibbet, the cross, not the altar, that is for St. Paul the pivot around which his theory of the death of Christ moves. Theologians have consequently misunderstood him, reading into his phraseology their own theories of the Atonement. Of that, however, this is not the place to speak.

When, through the ministry of Ananias, Saul had ad-

⁵ This reconstruction of the workings of Saul's mind during his career as a persecutor and through his conversion is not original with the writer, though long held by him; see C. C. Everett's *Gospel of Paul*, Boston, 1893; the writer's "The Spiritual Development of Paul," *New World*, VIII (1899), 111-124; *The Heart of the Christian Message*, 2nd ed., New York, 1912, pp. 29-37; *Studies in New Testament Christianity*, Philadelphia, 1928, pp. 86-89; *Christ and Evolution*, Philadelphia, 1934, pp. 139 ff.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

justed his thought to his new vision, St. Luke tells us that "Straightway in the synagogues he proclaimed Jesus, that he is the son of God, . . . that he increased the more in strength and confounded the Jews that dwelt at Damascus." This went on for some time, but at last the Jews became so embittered against him that they sought his life. We are now in a position to understand why this was so. His argument as to how the death of Christ on the cross, followed by the Resurrection, opened a mercy seat apart from the law, and that all who came by faith to that mercy seat, whether Jews or Gentiles, were exempt from keeping the law, was subversive of the most fundamental of all Jewish institutions. Throughout his ministry he was never able to present this point of view for long in a Jewish synagogue without a more or less violent break with its leaders. Under these circumstances, Saul, as he tells us in Galatians 1:17, went away into Arabia.

What is meant by Arabia, and why did he go there? Lightfoot, seventy years ago, noting that in Gal. 4:25 Mt. Sinai is said to be in Arabia, conceived the theory that St. Paul, like Elijah in a crisis of his life, went to Horeb, the place where the law was given, to meditate in quiet upon his late experiences, and to adjust his life gradually in the lapse of time to the implications of the experience he had encountered on the Damascus road. Such a view, in my judgment, reveals a failure to understand the nature of Saul of Tarsus. On the streets of Tarsus as a boy he had learned in the rugged school of life to make quick decisions, rapid adjustments, and speedily to adapt himself to new situations. The boy was father to the man. He who went "straightway" into the synagogues of Damascus after his

CONVERSION OF SAUL

conversion to face with keen logic and settled conviction his former sympathizers, needed no three-year period of retreat in which to think things through. He went to Arabia to preach, I believe. Arabia was, in my opinion, neither the desert nor Horeb; it was the kingdom of Aretas. It contained many populous cities. Many of these cities had their Jewish colonies, and Saul, I believe, went there to preach. The reasons for believing this will emerge more fully as we proceed.

After a time Saul returned again to Damascus, and again the Jewish hatred manifested itself. This time they invoked the aid of the governor of the town appointed by King Aretas; his soldiers guarded the gates. Saul, they thought, was this time not to escape, but his followers let him down over the wall in a large basket and he got away again (2 Cor. 11:32). As the Arabian government had now become antagonistic to him, he returned to Jerusalem. He himself tells us (Gal. 1:18) this return was "three years" after his departure for Damascus as a persecutor. In order, however, to estimate accurately the lapse of time, we must note that the Jews were accustomed to reckon parts of years as whole years. Thus, if Saul started for Damascus before the end of the year 30, was in Arabia all of the year 31, and returned to Jerusalem in the early months of the year 32, it would constitute in Jewish parlance "three years." There are reasons which lead us to believe that Saul was actually absent from Jerusalem less than two years, and that his return occurred in the summer of the year 32 A. D.

Of this visit to Jerusalem there are two accounts which, since the days of Ferdinand Christian Baur, have been regarded as contradictory. Baur thought that they could not

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

both be true, but we are now inclined to look at the matter differently. St. Luke says (Acts 9:26-30) that when he came to Jerusalem, the Apostles were afraid of him, that Barnabas explained to them how Saul had changed, that he was with them going in and going out, that he disputed with the Grecian Jews who ultimately plotted to kill him, and that he then went to Tarsus. St. Paul himself says (Gal. 1:18 ff.), that he was in Jerusalem only two weeks, that of the Apostles he saw only St. Peter and James the Lord's brother, that he then went into the regions of Syria and Cilicia, and that he was unknown by face to the churches of Judæa. It is now realized that by the time of which we are speaking there were churches in other cities of Judæa than the one in Jerusalem, and that it is quite possible that the Apostles other than St. Peter and St. James may have been temporarily absent from the Holy City, so that both representations may be true. It is noteworthy that at Jerusalem as in Damascus St. Paul's arguments aroused bitter opposition—opposition so bitter that it was necessary for him to flee.

When Saul returned to his native province of Cilicia, how did he busy himself? When St. Luke again mentions him in the pages of the Acts of the Apostles, at least ten years had passed. What was this restless man doing all that time? It is usually supposed that we cannot tell, or that he was busy at his trade as a saddle-maker (formerly thought to be tent-maker).

To me at least it is clear that, however many saddles he may have made and sold during these years, he was also busy preaching Christ and founding churches. Two bits of evidence that he was thus occupied lie before us in the pages

CONVERSION OF SAUL

of the Acts. When at a later date the Apostolic Synod at Jerusalem thought it necessary to send a letter to the Gentile converts, they addressed that letter to Gentiles "in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia," though there is no record that churches had ever been founded in Syria and Cilicia. It is noteworthy, however, that these are the two regions to which St. Paul himself says he went (Gal. 1:20) after his first visit to Jerusalem. Again we are told that, when unnamed and unauthorized Christians had carried Christianity to Antioch and had preached to Gentiles, and the Apostles had sent Barnabas to Antioch to see about it, Barnabas, seeing an opportunity for a great evangelistic work in that city, went to Tarsus to seek Saul (Acts 11:25), and, bringing him back, for a whole year they carried on together a most successful evangelistic work. Why did Barnabas look out Saul for this work? When a modern rector wishes to hold a preaching mission, he does not ask a professor of Systematic Divinity or of Biblical Criticism to come and do the preaching, he sends for a Cowley Father or some man who has attained success in that type of work. Under similar circumstances our Presbyterian brethren do not send for a modernistic professor from Union Seminary, or even the President of the Westminster Seminary, but for a man like Billy Sunday, who has a reputation as a revivalist. The fact that Barnabas sought out Saul is evidence that Saul had made a reputation as an expert in that type of work, and the results at Antioch proved the soundness of the judgment of Barnabas. With the zeal that made him a persecutor, Saul, from the time of his conversion at Damascus, had been winning Jew and Gentile to Christ.

Thus at first by persecution, and then of consecrated

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

purpose, the saddle-maker of Tarsus, in spite of the lack of vision of the Twelve, launched the Church on her missionary career. Thus Saul of Tarsus emerged as one of the powerful formative influences of the Apostolic Age.

II

MISSIONARY EFFORTS AND GOSPEL TRADITIONS

I

IN the first lecture we endeavored to appraise the influences which started the Apostolic Church on its career. That career at its very inception rendered the beginnings of the collection of the gospel story or of gospel stories necessary. What the Germans call *Formgeschichte*, but which has been more happily named by an American scholar "form-criticism," has opened our eyes to the needs and influences which led to the gradual gathering up of the narratives concerning Jesus which were later collected in our Gospels, and to some of the reasons why at least some of those stories took the form that they did. The accounts of the life and teachings of Jesus were not compiled because of literary or historical interest in the life of the Master. The first Christians believed that Jesus would soon return. Any year, or almost any day, might witness the end of the present order of the world. If Jesus himself were reigning here in person, what need would there be for a history of his life or a record of his teachings? It was a considerable time before such lengthy, though scanty records concerning him as our present Gospels give, came into existence, and these

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

were compiled from earlier and still more scrappy records. This is at least true of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

While all this is true, nevertheless, in spite of second adventist expectations, the situation demanded an interest in the events of the earthly life of Jesus, and compelled the compilation of some accounts of it. On the Day of Pentecost St. Peter preached to a congregation of Jews. St. Stephen, disputing in the synagogues of the Hellenists in Jerusalem, was still reasoning with Jews. St. Philip, preaching in Samaria, at Lydda, Joppa, or Caesarea, was still preaching to Jews, for, after all, the Samaritans were the earliest Jewish sect and shared many of the Jewish expectations. Saul of Tarsus, preaching in Damascus, or Arabia, in Cilicia or Syria, preached first to Jews. We know that at Damascus this was so, and we are safe in inferring that it was also true of the other localities because we learn, from the accounts in the Book of Acts of his later missionary activities, that it was his custom. To make a Jew a convert to Christianity, it was necessary to convince him that Jesus was the Messiah. It was a notorious fact that Jesus had been crucified. That fact no Jew could ignore and no Christian deny. It was necessary, therefore, in order to convince Jews of his Messiahship, to face the fact of his death boldly, but to carry the story on and convince them that God had borne witness to his unique character by raising him from the dead. That is the line of argument adopted by St. Peter on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2), by St. Paul at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts 13), and doubtless by all the early Christians in winning their converts. This necessity centered Christian thought on the Passion and Resurrection of Christ. Not

COLLECTING TRADITIONS OF JESUS

only was this part of the Master's career the theme of preaching, but it is probable that because of this, intelligent converts would wish to know more of his Death and Resurrection than would be given in sermons. It thus came about that the earliest narratives concerning the earthly career of our Lord were the accounts of his Passion and the Resurrection. It is due, too, both to this interest and to the early date of the tradition that the information given us concerning Passion Week is so much more detailed than that of any other part of our Lord's life. The collection of these traditions must have begun soon after Pentecost.

As the Christian mission progressed, even while its converts were Jews, a demand arose for other knowledge of Jesus than that contained in the stories of Passion Week. The ethical demands of Jesus were greater than those of Judaism; Jesus demanded an inward purity. Jesus' estimate of the value of sabbath-observance differed widely from that of the Pharisees. The way in which the oral law—the "traditions of the elders"—was sometimes permitted to annul ordinary moral obligations had been to him anathema. Something of this attitude of their Master the earliest Christians were bound to transmit to their new converts. In the effort to do this, pungent sayings of Jesus were collected and, to give these additional force, an incident giving the occasion when the saying was uttered was recalled and related. The incident accounted for the saying, and the saying gave point to the incident. An English critic, Professor Vincent Taylor, has named these "Pronouncement Stories." As an example of these we may take the story of the disciples passing through the cornfields on the sabbath and plucking the ears of corn in Mark 2:23-28. It leads up to the saying,

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

“The sabbath was made for man and not man for the sabbath: so that the Son of man is lord even of the sabbath.”

- The saying gave the Master's authority for placing humanitarian considerations above those of mere ritual. Such authority must have been needed at once, when Christianity had started upon its career as a Jewish sect. The story gave point to the saying. The pronouncement story of the “Tribute Money,” Mark 12:13 ff., leads up to the saying, “Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's.” As Vincent Taylor has shown,¹ there are thirty-five clearly defined pronouncement stories in the Synoptic Gospels, and four others that should probably be classified with them. Of these, twenty are in Mark, our earliest Gospel, four or five in Q, a document which is generally held to be older than Mark, seven or nine in Luke's special source, one in Matthew, and none in John. Bultmann,² a German critic, has attributed these stories to the creative imagination of the early Church. If it were true that they were creations of the Christian consciousness, they should be more numerous in the later than in the earlier Gospels. In reality the reverse is true. As Taylor has pointed out, these stories bear on their face evidence that they are genuine recollections of utterances of the Master and of incidents in his career. Occasionally one can detect in one of them a later editorial phrase, but the stories themselves fit situations in the life of Jesus. In all probability many of these stories took shape in Christian tradition in the course of the first decade after Pentecost.

¹ *Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, London, 1933, Lecture IV.

² *Geschichte der synoptische Tradition*, 1931, pp. 42, 49, 58, 63 f.

COLLECTING TRADITIONS OF JESUS

Personally I regard that, not as a probability, but as a certainty.

It would be wrong, however, to give the impression that the Christian traditions of this early period were confined to pronouncement stories. They included much besides. Jesus, like the Old Testament Prophets, often spoke in poetic form. With the form of Hebrew poetry we are all familiar from the Psalter. Its characteristic was a kind of rhyming of the thought which, since the eighteenth century, scholars have called "parallelism." Familiar examples will occur to each of us, such as

He maketh me to lie down in green pastures,
He leadeth me beside still waters.

Or

The Lord knoweth the way of the righteous,
But the way of the wicked shall perish.

Such sayings are easily remembered, and almost every nation possesses proverbs cast in that form. In this early period of the teaching, collections of such sayings began to be made. Burton Scott Easton ³ and Vincent Taylor ⁴ are of the opinion that one or two of them go back to the lifetime of Jesus and were dictated by him.

Some of the most significant teachings of Jesus are contained in his parables. Indeed, Jesus raised the parable to the highest degree of beauty and literary excellence that it has ever reached, and in so doing made a contribution to literature. In collecting material for the instruction of con-

³ *Christ in the Gospels*, 1930, p. 41.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 94 f.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

verts to Christianity during this first decade, certainly some at least of the parables were recalled and took form in the tradition. To the same early date and interest must be assigned the miracle stories and many of the stories about Jesus. A number of the stories about him recall how he looked on certain occasions, how he bore himself, or refer to his habits in a way that imply a personal recollection. Bultmann believes that the miracle stories were told as proofs of the Messianic power of Jesus, but a careful study of the Synoptic Gospels leads me to the opposite opinion. The Jews regarded miracles as "signs," and this early tradition represents Jesus as saying that no sign shall be given to this generation (Matt. 12:39; Luke 11:29). The miracles were told simply because they were believed to be a part of the story of his life. His disciples had seen him do things which neither they nor their neighbors could do, and they believed he did them by supernatural power. They simply told what they believed.

There are other stories about Jesus, such as the Temptation and the Transfiguration, which come under none of the classifications so far mentioned. These stories, many of them, betray an interest in Jesus for his own sake. Doubtless such stories began to be collected and repeated in the traditions of this first decade of the Church. The Apostles were still alive, and there were others, like James the Less, who had known Jesus well, and still others, we know not how many, in the Christian fold who had listened to the Master's teachings and, as Christians preached and taught and thought upon the Master whom they loved, the love of their hearts as well as the exigencies of their work led them to recall, to collect, and to tell and retell stories of

CALIGULA AND HIS STATUE

him who had changed their lives and brought God near. Perhaps, like Papias of a later time, they still thought more of the living voice of tradition than of a written word, but in any event they laid the foundations of that Christian tradition on which our knowledge of the life of Christ rests. Some form-critics have been too skeptical, but on the whole they have helped us to visualize, at least in dim outline, but in a vital way, how at the very beginning of Apostolic history, while eye witnesses were abundant, the Gospel traditions in all their important features were formed. At first they were not combined into connected wholes; they were just disconnected stories and sayings that were told and repeated until they took a definite form.

II

Thus the life of the Church went on for ten years. During all this time Christianity remained a Jewish sect and was content to do so. The Gospel was preached only to Jews and to such Gentiles as had become Jewish proselytes. Perhaps St. Peter had before the year 40 (though, as some scholars think,⁵ it may have been after 44 A. D.), preached to Cornelius at Caesarea. Cornelius was a proselyte of the gate, but the narrative of the Book of Acts makes it clear that that was regarded as an exceptional instance. Probably Saul of Tarsus had preached to Gentiles in Arabia, Cilicia, and northern Syria, but if so, his converts were too far removed from the Palestinian sources from which St. Luke later drew his information to make any impression upon them. Christianity was still Jewish, and the center of its interest

⁵ See Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, II, 159.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

was Palestine. Like Judaism, it was therefore profoundly stirred, and more profoundly affected than most Christians realize, by the effort of the Emperor Caius (Caligula), to set up a statue of himself in the temple at Jerusalem, and to compel the Jews to do religious honors to it.

The Emperor Augustus, as is well known, had inaugurated the worship of the Genius of the emperor in order to utilize religious sentiment in holding together his heterogeneous empire. Julius Caesar, because of aid given him by Antipater, the father of Herod the Great, had granted the Jews special privileges for their religion, and Augustus, knowing well Jewish peculiarities, had exempted them from the necessity of participating in the imperial cult. Tiberius had continued the exemption. Caligula, who had made himself agreeable to his subjects at the beginning of his reign, became insanely conceited, arrogant, and self-assertive after a little. He called himself the brother of Jupiter, and made his subjects in approaching him prostrate themselves as to a god. In the year 39 he determined that the Jews should be compelled, along with all his other subjects, to worship his statue. Accordingly in that year he sent Petronius to Antioch as proconsul of Syria with orders to proceed to Palestine with an army, erect the statue in Jerusalem, and, if the Jews would not submit to it peaceably, to compel them by force to do so.

Petronius acted with all promptitude. He apparently reached Antioch during the summer of 39 and by November had collected an army and arrived at Ptolemais, the Accho of an earlier time, with his force. The struggles which followed are vividly described by Josephus.⁶ In-

⁶ *Antiquities*, XVIII, 8, 2-9.

CALIGULA AND HIS STATUE

formed of the purpose of the coming of Petronius, Jews flocked to Ptolemais in myriads to say that, while alive, they could not permit it. Petronius threatened them, but they were unmoved. It was the time for sowing their fields, but they left them unsown and faced starvation in order to protest. Petronius moved to Tiberias in order better to observe the Jews, and similar scenes were repeated there. They bared their necks and invited him to slay them rather than to compel them to witness the sacrilege. Petronius finally wrote an adroit letter to Caligula, advising the Emperor not to desolate a country that paid a considerable tribute, but rather to change his purpose as to the statue. Meantime King Agrippa I, who had been made by his friend Caligula king of Ituræa and Trachonitis, territories formerly ruled by Herod Philip, and who was in Rome, made a great banquet for Caligula and flattered him in various ways. When the Emperor, touched by the attention, and filled with wine, urged Agrippa to proffer a request for some gift, Agrippa asked in a flattering speech, that Caligula would abandon his purpose of erecting his statue in Jerusalem. This the Emperor granted. A little later, however, the letter of Petronius urging the Emperor to do the same thing arrived. That a subordinate officer should venture to advise an emperor who regarded himself as a god, threw Caligula into paroxysms of rage. He determined now to erect the statue at all costs, and so wrote Petronius, at the same time advising that officer to commit suicide. These events had occupied many months, so leisurely did affairs move in those ancient days of slow communication. This letter to Petronius was written late in the year 40 A. D. During a whole year, therefore, the Jews of Palestine were

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

under the strain of this high tension. On Jan. 24th, 41 A. D., Caligula was murdered. Fortunately for Petronius the ship carrying the news of the murder of the Emperor outsailed the ship carrying the letter commanding suicide, and arrived in Palestine first. Petronius, of course, abandoned the mission which had become so distasteful to him, and the crisis was over. Claudius, an uncle of Caligula, succeeded him, and confirmed the Jews in their ancient privileges.

III

That this exciting crisis stirred the Christians as deeply as it did the rest of the Jews is not a matter of conjecture. One of them wrote a little apocalypse in the name of Jesus, to indicate that this repetition of the abomination which Antiochus Epiphanes had erected in the temple in the year 168 B. C., and which precipitated the Maccabæan revolt, would be the beginning of the end of the present age, and later, when St. Mark compiled his Gospel, this apocalypse was mistaken by St. Mark for genuine words of Jesus, and as such, was woven into the thirteenth chapter of his Gospel. It can now be separated from the genuine words of our Lord, which in some respects it contradicts. It was made up of what are now verses 7, 8, 14-20, 24-27, and 30, 31 of the chapter mentioned.

Apocalypse is a peculiar type of prophecy which had grown up after 200 B. C., when prophecy proper had practically died out. The authors of apocalypses did not dare prophesy in their own names. They knew that they would not be believed, because their contemporaries were all sure that the age of inspiration had ended. They therefore at-

CALIGULA AND HIS STATUE

tributed their visions to some recognized authoritative hero, usually to one who had lived some time before. The apocalyptists had a well defined theory of world history. They believed the world hopelessly bad. All God could do with the present order was to destroy it in a great cataclysm and by miraculous intervention give the rule of the world into the hands of his saints, the Jews. It is a theory now forever exploded, but it was the first universal philosophy of history ever to be proposed. Our Lord himself had lived under the spell of this theory and had, as a matter of course, accepted it. Nevertheless his unparalleled ethical insight led him to perceive and to utter many things inconsistent with it. While accepting it, he in many ways transcended it.

This unknown apocalyptist of the year 40 A. D., however, doubtless believed himself authorized by the Holy Spirit to prophesy in the name of Jesus that the untoward events of that year were the beginning of the end of the age, and, as has been said, his little utterance was in due time woven into the thirteenth chapter of St. Mark's Gospel. When the authors of St. Matthew and St. Luke, employing Mark as a source, reworked this chapter for their Gospels, they obliterated the lines which divide it from the real words and thoughts of Jesus, and Matthew at least adds to them. Although this has been recognized by a long line of scholars for more than sixty years, it has been denied by Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer. Such scholars make this little apocalypse a part of their ground for supposing that Jesus was wholly a child of his age. To recognize the facts as I have stated them is a part of our task of ascertaining the truth and restoring the picture of the Master to its actual proportions.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

The events of this struggle of the year 40 left their impress also on the thirteenth chapter of the Book of Revelation. Scholars are agreed that the book in its present form dates from the reign of Domitian about 90 A. D. They are also agreed that its author or compiler wove into his book earlier material, i. e., apocalyptic utterances that had taken shape in former generations. Whether this material had been preserved in the form of complete apocalypses, or as mere fragments, is a point on which there is no agreement. The reference in Rev. 13:14-18 points clearly to the reign of Caligula, and indicates that, however much the chapter may have been reëdited, it had its beginnings then.

Both the original author of Rev. 13 and that of the Apocalypse of Jesus thought that the impious act of Caligula was an excess of the Man of Sin which betokened the beginning of the end. These works greatly stimulated Christian hope of the early return of Jesus, and intensified Christian second adventism. Claudius, however, succeeded Caligula, and granted the Jews free exercise of their religion. St. Paul, who had shared the expectations of the Master's early return, soon recognized that it could not occur while Claudius reigned. In writing to the Thessalonians on the subject (2 Thes. 2:6, 7) he points out that the coming cannot occur until the "lawless one" fully manifests himself, and that he could not then manifest himself because there was "one that restraineth" (ὁ κατέχων), or "a restraining thing" (τὸ κατέχον), which would have to be removed before that manifestation could occur. Scholars recognize in these Greek phrases for "one that restrains" a Greek translation of a part of the verb *claudere*, "to shut up," or "shut off," "restrain," probably the participle

FAMINE IN JUDÆA

claudens, a play on the name of Claudius. St. Paul accordingly confirms the deep impression that was made on Christians by the events of the Jewish crisis of the year 40 A. D. It greatly intensified the apocalyptic element in early Christian beliefs.

IV

Within two or three years after the exciting events of the year 40, Christianity reached Antioch, the capital of Syria. To the Apostles at Jerusalem the exciting thing was not so much that converts had been won in this third city of the Roman Empire, but that irresponsible men had, in their enthusiasm, actually preached to Gentiles and welcomed them into the fold without insisting that they become Jews. The matter was regarded as of so much importance that Barnabas was sent from Jerusalem to the Syrian city to look into the matter. Barnabas, on his arrival, took a liberal view of the situation, saw an opportunity for greatly extending the work, went to Tarsus and induced Saul to come and help him, and they two carried on for a whole year a most successful mission there. A strong church, containing a considerable Gentile element, was founded, and the name "Christian" was given to the followers of Jesus.

While this work was in progress at Antioch, James the son of Zebedee was martyred at Jerusalem. Claudius in the year 41 A. D. had added Judæa and Samaria to the territories of Herod Agrippa I. Caligula, on the banishment of Antipas to Gaul, had previously in 39 A. D. given him Galilee and Peræa, so that he now governed nearly all the territories over which his grandfather, Herod the Great, had ruled. Why Agrippa selected James for execution,

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

neither the Book of Acts nor any other authority informs us. Agrippa's death is clearly to be dated in the year 44 A. D., and it seems certain that the martyrdom of James and the imprisonment of Peter occurred earlier in that year.

In the year 45 or 46 there was a severe famine in Palestine, when, according to Josephus,⁷ many were reduced to the verge of starvation. According to Acts 11:28 this had been predicted in Antioch by a prophet named Agabus, and the Antiochian Christians determined to send relief to Jerusalem. This they did, making Barnabas and Saul the messengers who bore their bounty. It is altogether probable that the relief was sent when the famine actually occurred. If the Christians of Antioch were at all like us, they did not send their contributions while the Jerusalem Christians were prosperous, just because someone had prophesied that they were going to be in need. It is probable, therefore, that the visit was coincident with the famine, either in the year 45 or 46 A. D.

Around this visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem much discussion has raged for a hundred years. In his Epistle to the Galatians (ch. 2:1) St. Paul declares in the most solemn manner that it was fourteen years after the visit to Jerusalem mentioned in Gal. 1:16, and which we have dated in the year 32, before he went up to the Holy City again. As scholars have persisted in identifying this visit mentioned in Gal. 2 with that mentioned in Acts 15, they have felt sure that St. Luke is in error (Acts 11:30 and 12:25) in representing him as having gone to Jerusalem in connection with the famine. Pages upon pages of argument have

⁷ See Josephus, *Antiquities*, III, 15, 3; and XX, 2, 5. On the date cf. K. Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, V, 454 f.

ST. PAUL AT JERUSALEM

been written pro and con. After pondering all the considerations and arguments, I have come to the conviction that the late Cyril Emmet⁸ was right in identifying the visit described by St. Paul in Gal. 2:1 ff. with this visit to Jerusalem which St. Luke places at the time of the famine. Chronologically it fits exactly.

In this connection it should be noted that many students of the Apostolic Age have failed to understand what a serious and long-continued dispute the question of whether or not the Gospel should be preached to the Gentiles was bound to be. They have regarded it as a difference of opinion that might come up once, as at the conference of Acts 15, but which could be settled by a vote once for all. The history of the differences between High Church Anglicans and Low Church Anglicans during the past hundred years should have given scholars a saner perspective in the study of this problem of the Apostolic Age. The party represented by James the Less, which held that a Gentile ought to become a Jew in order to be a good Christian, was the High Church party. That represented by Barnabas and Saul corresponded to the Low or Broad Church party. In their case, as in ours, their religion was at bottom the same; the difference consisted in the thought-patterns by which they explained it, and the consequent attitude toward certain ceremonial minutiae which they thought should be maintained. The experience of the Anglican communion for the past century shows that such differences are never settled. They are always cropping up; they are always precipitating new discussions. Convictions on such thought-patterns are deep; on either side they are not uprooted by

⁸ *Beginnings of Christianity*, II, 277 ff.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

a few arguments, a successful mission, a Broad Church book, or a few Catholic congresses. Decade after decade the discussion goes on. Quite analogous to this was the difference between James and the Jerusalem Christians and the ardent missionaries, of whom St. Paul came to be the best known, in the Apostolic Age. After many years of study I have come to think that both Acts and Galatians are trustworthy documents and that St. Paul in Gal. 2 is describing details of his visit to Jerusalem in the year 45 or 46.

If, then, we make this identification, St. Paul in Galatians gives us some details of what happened at Jerusalem. It was not simply an incident of giving and receiving money, but there was discussion with Peter, James, and John as to whether it was in accordance with the mind of the Master that the Gospel should be carried to the Gentiles. Apparently the question had not yet reached a point in the minds of the Jerusalem Church as a whole such that it was thought necessary to consult others than the Apostolic leaders. As a result, the three Apostles, Peter, James, and John, gave to Barnabas and Paul the right hand of fellowship, that the latter should preach to the Gentiles, while the former preached to Jews (Gal. 2:9). Titus, a Greek, one of the new converts, accompanied the missionary Apostles on this occasion, and his case entered into the discussion, but St. Paul writes about it in language so vague (Gal. 2:3-5) that we do not know whether Titus was circumcised or not. If we place the emphasis, in reading the passage, on certain words it means that surely Titus was not circumcised; if we place the emphasis otherwise, the passage can mean that Titus was circumcised, but not as a matter of necessity but out of Christian consideration for the feelings of the

ST. PAUL AT JERUSALEM

Jewish brethren. One thing is, however, made very clear. There was a small but bitter party of Judaisers in Jerusalem. St. Paul speaks of them as "false brethren who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ." Under the circumstances there was bound to be a small nucleus of irreconcilables in every Jewish community and consequently in nearly every Christian church, the majority of the members of which were still Jews. Peter, James, and John might agree to let Paul and Barnabas preach to Gentiles without molestation from them, but there were many Jewish Christians who felt bound by no such obligation. While a *modus vivendi* had been arranged with the Jerusalem Apostles, the controversy had by no means ended. Indeed, it had just begun.

V

Not long after Paul and Barnabas returned from Jerusalem to Antioch, that Church decided to send these two effective preachers on a mission. St. Luke tells us that "The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." How the Holy Ghost uttered this, we are not told, but it was probably said by some prophet. In obedience to this voice, the Antiochian Christians formally laid their hands on Barnabas and Saul in token that the missionaries went forth with the Church's commission and authority. So Barnabas and Saul set forth on what is usually called "the first missionary journey," accompanied by Barnabas's cousin, John Mark, as helper.

It is unnecessary here to repeat the details of this journey. Of their travels, hardships, and successes in Cyprus, at

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

Antioch in Psidia, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of the Acts give a full account, and a knowledge of the familiar story will be taken for granted. We may only pause to note that on their way home, in visiting the congregations they had established in Asia Minor, the Apostles appointed "elders," *presbuteroi*, presbyters, in every church. This is the earliest reference in the New Testament to the second order of the Christian ministry. But what was the function of these presbyters? On what analogy were they appointed? Much study has been given to the subject by Christian scholars, and it is now well known that their appointment was in accordance with the form of government of all local oriental communities, in which the leadership or control was uniformly in the hands of the older men. As a matter of course, therefore, some older men were selected in each community—men of sturdy Christian character and good judgment—and the general decisions necessary to community matters were committed to their hands. It is clear from a number of ancient Christian documents that at this time the preaching and the exercise of spiritual gifts were not the special function of the presbyters. Those functions came to be exercised by them only after the lapse of much time. At the date of which we are speaking (about 47 A. D.) the presbyters corresponded apparently more nearly to a vestry than to anything else in the modern church.

VI

A problem that has been much discussed during the last forty years is, Where were the churches of Galatia situated?

THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA

Were the churches of Antioch in Psidia, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe the churches of Galatia? The problem has arisen because in the Roman Empire the term "Galatia" was employed in two senses. Sometimes it denoted the land of a race; sometimes, a Roman political unit which embraced territories inhabited by several peoples. This ambiguity grew out of the history of Asia Minor.

The Gauls of the Rhineland and northern France are known to us all from our student days. We made our acquaintance with them through Caesar's *Commentaries on the Gallic War*. They were a restless people, pushing their way into Great Britain and Ireland, but on two historic occasions they surged southeastward. On the first of these sallies they overran Italy and sacked Rome in 410 B. C. On the second, they surged across Macedonia and Thrace, some of them finding their way into Asia Minor, others into Greece. In Greece they sacked Delphi in 279 B. C. Those that invaded Asia Minor were finally pushed by the kingdoms of Pergamos and Antioch into the highlands of Phrygia, where they settled. Their country came to be called by Greek-speaking peoples Galatia, just as the land inhabited by Gauls in the West was called by the Latins Gallia. After a complicated history, into the details of which we need not enter here,⁹ when the Roman province of Galatia was organized in 25 B. C., there was included in it, because of this previous history, large tracts of land that had belonged to other kingdoms, notably Lycaonia, Phrygia, and Psidia. It was long thought that in the New Testament "Galatia" was employed in the national sense, and that the churches of Galatia were in the mountain region

⁹ For details see K. Lake in *Beginnings of Christianity*, V, 233.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

where Gaelic, a language akin to Welsh, was spoken. The ablest and most persuasive presentation of this view is that of Bishop Lightfoot in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. On this view we do not know the name of a single Galatian Church or Christian. Lightfoot supposed that there were churches in such cities as Tavium, Pessinus, and Ancyra the modern Angora, but they are never mentioned in the New Testament.

In 1893 W. M. Ramsay, in his *Church and the Roman Empire before 170 A.D.*, advocated the view that in the New Testament "Galatia" was employed in the Roman political sense, and that the Churches of Galatia were those founded on the first missionary journey, Antioch in Psidia, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe. Ramsay's theory is called the "South Galatian Theory," and Lightfoot's the "North Galatian Theory." The question is a complicated one and perhaps we shall never be able to settle it with certainty, but the South Galatian Theory is now accepted by the majority of scholars and is, I believe, right. St. Paul in his missionary labors sought out Greek-speaking centers, and it is probable that in Tavium, Pessinus, and Ancyra Gaelic was spoken. In Lystra we know that Lycaonian was the language of the heathen majority—a tongue of which we now know apparently an earlier form under the name Luvish from the Hittite inscriptions found at Boghaz Koi in 1896—but there was also a Greek population. It is clear that the Epistle to the Galatians was written to Greek-speaking communities, and those communities were in all probability those of Antioch in Psidia, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe. We shall assume that this is the historic fact. While

THE CHURCHES OF GALATIA

it is not absolutely certain, the evidence makes it more probable than any other hypothesis.

On this hypothesis the Epistle to the Galatians was written to the churches established on the first missionary journey, and the evidence indicates that it was not written long after that journey ended. In Gal. 1:6 St. Paul says, "I marvel that ye are so quickly removing from him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel." It would seem that at the most only a few months could have elapsed since he left them. On the other hand he implies in Gal. 4:13 that, when he wrote the Epistle, he had visited these churches twice and preached in them. This condition is fulfilled by the first missionary journey on which the Apostles, after their labors at Derbe were completed, turned back and visited the congregations in the other churches again. We conclude, then, that the Epistle to the Galatians was written from Antioch not later than the year 48 A. D. On this view the Epistle antedates the Apostolic council at Jerusalem described in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, and many difficulties which scholars have found, either with the historicity of the Acts or the good faith of St. Paul, disappear.

VII

The occasion of the Epistle to the Galatians is made clear by the Epistle itself. There were Jewish Christians who were not willing to observe the agreement made by Peter, James, and John that Paul and Barnabas were at liberty to proclaim a gospel which did not require the dis-

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

ciples to observe the Jewish law. Perhaps these zealous people did not even know of the existence of that agreement. At all events some of these had visited the churches of Galatia after the departure of the Apostles and had persuaded a number of the Gentiles to be circumcised and to keep the Jewish law. There seem to have been some of them engaged in agriculture who attempted to observe the sabbatical year which fell in 47-48 A. D. (See Gal. 4:10). In their effort to do this they had denied that St. Paul had any first-hand knowledge of Christianity. They claimed that what little he did know about it, he had obtained from the Jerusalem Apostles; that he was a time-server, acting one way among Jews and another way among Gentiles. So they belittled his authority. This activity of Jewish Christians was a part of that long and inevitable clash between religious thought-patterns to which reference has already been made.

While all this is clear, perhaps it is not the whole explanation of St. Paul's letter. Two scholars, Wilhelm Lüt-gert¹⁰ and the late James H. Ropes,¹¹ have pointed out that there are passages in the Epistle to the Galatians which indicate that there was in Galatia, as we know that there was at a later time in Corinth, an antinomian party that regarded itself as freed from all moral law, and charged St. Paul with inconsistency and with observing the moral law, because he insisted upon morality. These scholars have, I think, made out their case. There are passages in the letter which are hardly intelligible on the theory that the letter

¹⁰ In *Gesetz und Geist*, Gütersloh, 1919.

¹¹ *The Singular Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians*, Cambridge, Mass., 1919.

EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS

was directed against the Jewish party alone. That such a party should arise was, under the circumstances, most natural. The logic of Saul of Tarsus which first made him a persecutor and then made him a Christian, and which we traced in the last lecture, led him to believe that God had, by the death of Jesus on the cross and by raising him from the dead, opened in Christ a mercy seat, to which men could come and be free from the law. Neither St. Paul nor the Jews of his time distinguished as we do between the ceremonial and the moral laws. All had come from God; it was all equally binding. If God abrogated a part, he had abrogated the whole. That this was St. Paul's view is shown by his discussion of incest and sex-relations in 1 Cor. 6. It is noteworthy that there he appeals neither to the prohibited degrees of marriage in Lev. 18 and 20, nor to the seventh commandment, but declares: "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient. All things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any," and then goes on to argue in substance that a man should abstain from fornication, not because it violates a commandment not to do so, but because to do so is to commit spiritual suicide. In the Epistle to the Galatians the same principles are enunciated in another way. The sins which are denounced and prohibited in the law are portrayed (Gal. 5:19 ff.) as "the works of the flesh," whereas those things which are the notes of holiness are described as "the fruit of the spirit" (Gal. 5:22 f.). Lütgert and Ropes are probably right in their theory that this antinomian party in Galatia claimed to be *pneumatici*, or "spirituals." It was they who charged St. Paul with inconsistency; it was they who accused him of still preaching circumcision (Gal. 5:11). To

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

them St. Paul says in substance, "You are not spiritual at all; the indulgences which you are allowing yourselves are works of the flesh. Those who are spiritual exhibit the fruits of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, meekness, self-control." The existence of such a group of antinomians in Galatia and later at Corinth reveals one of the dangers of the severe logic of St. Paul's position. Many were able to follow his logic, while unable to share his moral earnestness and spiritual sincerity. They still needed the Ten Commandments, which the Church retained. St. Paul is the only writer in the New Testament who tries to rise above this necessity. His great successor, the author of the Fourth Gospel, insists that "he that saith I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him" (1 John 2:4).

St. Paul's argument against the Judaisers in the Epistle to the Galatians is in substance as follows. The book of Genesis tells us that God made a covenant with Abraham on the basis of faith. Abraham believed God's promise, so his faith was counted to him for righteousness. The religion of faith is therefore older by four hundred and thirty years than the religion of law. The same God who made the promise to Abraham and confirmed it by an oath also gave the law. The law could not therefore abrogate the promise, for even in human covenants unilateral modification is unthinkable. What, then, was the purpose of the law? It was given for the guidance of mankind during the minority of the race, just as parental rules are given for the guidance of children and minors. Now that Christ has come, the law is no longer needed for those who place themselves under his leadership. They have come of age; they are no longer

CATECHISTS

minors; they are free. Christ creates in them a new spirit—the spirit that brings forth love, joy, peace, and all the virtues of the Christian life. Faith is the bond that unites to Christ—faith such as Abraham had and on the basis of which God established the covenant with him. These children of faith are the real “seed of Abraham” rather than those who happened to be descended from his physical form.

This is an early sketch of this part of St. Paul’s theology. It is not a complete theology; it only embraces the aspects that were pertinent to the question at issue, but so far as we can tell it remained constant in his mind throughout his life. Nine or ten years later he put this theory in a more elaborate form in the Epistle to the Romans, but the argument itself remained the same.

What the outcome of this controversy with the Galatians was, the New Testament does not tell us. Apparently the Epistle had some effect, for twice after this on his second and third missionary journeys St. Paul preached among them (see Acts 16:1–6 and 18:23). Christian churches also existed there down to the Mohammedan conquest.

VIII

One other point must be noted before we leave the Galatian Epistle. Already there existed in the Christian Church a method of instructing converts. In Gal. 6:6 St. Paul exhorts those who are catechized in the word to share with him that catechized them in all good things. Here we have instructors in the word who are dependent on their pupils for their living. They were probably not

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

members of the Galatian communities, but sojourners who had come from centers where Christianity had been longer established. It would seem to have been their duty to instruct converts in the teachings of Jesus. In all probability such catechists had in written form a body of Jesus' teaching—pronouncement stories, poetical sayings, parables, miracle stories, etc., the beginnings of which we traced earlier in this lecture. Such a compilation, regarded as the oldest document underlying our Gospels, was employed by the authors of our first and third Gospels. Since 1907 scholars have followed the late Adolf Harnack in calling this document Q. It has long been thought by some that Q was compiled between 40 and 50 A. D. Personally I would put it nearer to the year 40 than to the year 50. Q was compiled for the use of just such instruction as that given in Galatia, and, while we cannot prove that the catechists of Galatia had it in their possession, it seems to me very probable that they did.

It thus appears that before the year 49, nineteen years after the Crucifixion, the mission of winning the world to Christ was well started, and that in the Apostolic circle St. Paul was assuming a place of leadership. Gospel traditions, too, were being industriously collected in ever larger aggregates. As we shall see in the next lecture, however, the question as to the right to be Christian without first being Jew was still denied by many.

III

CHRISTIANITY ENCOMPASSES THE ÆGEAN SEA

I

IN former lectures we have traced the history of the first eighteen years after Pentecost, and have witnessed the emergence within the infant Christian Church of two opposing conceptions of the Christian life. The one, championed by St. Paul and acquiesced in by Barnabas and many others, held that for those who had faith in Jesus Christ and identified themselves with his cause, the law was forever dead. The other held that the law, because it was God's law, could never be superseded; it was eternally binding. The Messianic hope was for Jews only. If Gentiles would share it, they must first become Jews. During the first eighteen years of the Church's history these opposing conceptions had emerged; they had attracted adherents, and on four occasions, of which the New Testament gives records, had found expression. Two of these were in Jerusalem (Acts 11:1-18 and Gal. 2:1-10), one in Antioch (Gal. 2:11-17), and one in Galatia. Although on each occasion our records show that the more liberal point of view had prevailed, nevertheless the forces of narrow devotion to ancient Jewish institutions

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

were by no means convinced, and by the year 49 they were ready for another attack.

After the first missionary journey was ended, and perhaps while St. Paul was dictating his Epistle to the Galatians, certain men came from Judæa to Antioch and taught, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." Paul and Barnabas opposed this teaching with all vigor, the Antiochian Church was greatly disturbed, and finally Paul and Barnabas, with certain other brethren, were appointed to go up to Jerusalem and confer with the Apostles and elders there about this question. It thus came about that the first Christian Synod or Council was held at Jerusalem in this year 49 A. D. It should be noted, however, that, though the names "Synod" and "Council" have been applied to this gathering, it was in reality neither the one nor the other, if we judge it by later standards. The great majority of Christians then existing were not concerned in it at all. It was simply a conference of delegates from the Church at Antioch with the leaders of the mother Church at Jerusalem.

The story of this conference need not here be retold. It is written in the fifteenth chapter of the Book of Acts and is familiar to all. It issued a letter to the brethren of the Gentiles of the churches of Syria and Cilicia, giving it as the judgment of the conferees that only four of the requirements of the law need be observed. They asked them to abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication. It is not altogether clear just what dictated this choice of requirements. Perhaps it was the feeling that these

JERUSALEM COUNCIL

things were involved often in heathen worship and that from such worship Christians should abstain. For the request not to eat things strangled, Codex Bezae substitutes, "and that you do not do to others what you would not wish them to do to you,"—a revision which hardly commends itself.

The decision embodied in this letter once more gave the victory to the liberal party, and the Antiochian delegation soon returned to the city whence they came, accompanied by a couple of "prophets" from Jerusalem, whose names were Judas and Silas. Silas, or Silvanus, as he was also called, was destined to become prominent as co-laborer of St. Paul.

II

Not long after this, St. Paul proposed to St. Barnabas that they revisit the churches which they had founded. Barnabas consented, but wished again to take as their helper his cousin, John Mark. St. Paul had, however, not forgotten St. Mark's desertion at Perga on their first journey just as they were approaching the most dangerous part of their way through the mountain passes of the Taurus. It was a desertion which St. Paul resented, and he positively refused to permit St. Mark to be a member of the party. These great Apostles were very human. The contention between them became so sharp that they separated, Barnabas taking Mark and setting out for Cyprus, his native land, while Paul chose Silas as his companion and set out overland, by way of northern Syria for his own native land, Cilicia. Thus early in Christian history did Christian laborers begin to refuse to work together

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

because of differences over little things. It is an example that has been followed all too often in the Church. In the instance of Paul and Barnabas the Church obtained two missions instead of one, but the Apostles, although they differed in a very human way, had the good sense to go to different fields of labor, while most of their modern imitators turn the Gospel into a Babel by becoming rivals in the same field.

Although the Book of Acts dismisses Barnabas and Mark at this point, it will repay us to follow them for a moment in imagination. While we have no detailed account of their work, it is clear that it was no brief undertaking, but was an effort sustained through the years. Six or seven years later, when St. Paul wrote his first Epistle to the Corinthians, Barnabas was still engaged in missionary labors and was following St. Paul's own plan of self-support (see 1 Cor. 9:6). In what fields he labored we are not informed, but it is probable that during all those years St. Mark was his companion and helper. Twelve or fourteen years later, while St. Paul was a prisoner in Rome, he asked that Mark come to him (2 Tim. 4:11);¹ but for several years after the autumn of 49 A. D. he was, apparently, the fellow worker of Barnabas.

III

In my opinion it was at this time, and for use in the missions founded by his cousin and himself, that St. Mark

¹ Although the Pastoral Epistles are clearly not St. Paul's in their present form, there is in 2 Tim. 4:9 f. a genuine Pauline fragment, as many scholars have recognized.

GOSPEL OF MARK

composed the first draft of his Gospel. Many European scholars have believed that the Gospel according to Mark was issued in two forms at different times in the Apostolic Age; in other words that it went through two editions. One of the most weighty reasons in favor of this is the fact that St. Luke, whose literary habit it was to copy his sources entire, omits all the material now contained between Mark 6:46 and 8:27, uniting in two successive verses (Lu. 9:17, 18), Mark 6:46 and 8:27 as though the latter followed immediately on the former in his copy of St. Mark. There are other reasons based on other omissions by Luke. I have treated the matter in some detail in an article published some years ago,² and this is not the place to thresh it out again. While the theory of an Ur-Marcus, as the Germans call it, has been rejected by many eminent scholars, it accounts best, I believe, for all the facts. The Gospel of Mark, which Clement of Alexandria declared to have been written at Rome,³ was, I believe, the second and enlarged edition of the Gospel, made by St. Mark himself some years later.

The reasons which led St. Mark to make this first compilation of his Gospel are tolerably clear. It was as necessary in the churches which were founded by Barnabas to give catechetical instruction to converts as in the Pauline churches. For use in congregations, a large portion of which were Jewish, Q was an unsatisfactory manual, for it contained no account of our Lord's Passion, and, as was pointed out in a former lecture, to convince Jews of the

² See *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLVIII, 239-247.

³ See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, VI, 14. Cf. also B. W. Bacon, *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?*

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

Messiahship of Jesus, it was necessary boldly to face the shame of the Cross and to demonstrate how that shame was followed by the glory of the Resurrection. Here then was the necessity and the motive, and Mark was in some ways peculiarly qualified for the task. The first Church at Jerusalem had apparently been held in his mother's house. When Herod Agrippa imprisoned St. Peter, it was at his mother's house that the Church was gathered to pray for him (Acts 12:12). Indeed, there is reason to believe that Mark's father had been a friend of Jesus, and that it was in the "upper room" of that same house that Jesus had eaten his last supper with his disciples. It has also long been suspected that the young man who followed Jesus to Gethsemane to watch, and who barely escaped arrest, fleeing naked, having left his garment in the hands of the temple police (Mark 14:51), was none other than St. Mark himself. As Peter and other Apostles had often been guests at his mother's house, St. Mark had had unusual opportunities to hear the stories concerning Jesus repeated again and again, and I cannot doubt that, as they pursued their mission, and the necessity of a fuller manual for instructing converts "in the Word" was felt, his cousin Barnabas urged upon him the composition of the work. Naturally we cannot prove that these conjectures represent the facts, but they seem to me, in the light of such knowledge as we have, to be the probable course of events. If our conjectures are right, the disagreement between Paul and Barnabas, and the establishment of a separate mission by Barnabas, led to the compilation of the earliest form of our earliest existing Gospel.

SECOND MISSIONARY JOURNEY

IV

It is time, however, that we returned to Paul and Silas. After their visit to Cilicia they passed on, apparently through the Cilician Gates, into the Province of Galatia. At Lystra St. Paul selected Timothy, a boy then apparently in his late teens, a half-Greek, half-Jew, who had been converted on the previous trip, as a helper in their travels. Timothy thus supplied to him the place that Mark had occupied on the first journey. It is needless to recount here the story so familiar to all, since it is recorded in the sixteenth chapter of the Acts. We know how St. Paul groped for a field in which to labor, thinking first of the province of Asia, then of Bithynia, and finally in his doubt reaching the sea at Troas, the representative in his day of the storied city of Troy. At Troas he apparently fell in with Luke,⁴ a physician, who appears to have been a Macedonian, and him he won to Christianity. Probably Luke urged him to go over and preach in Macedonia, but, until the plan had been given divine sanction in a dream, St. Paul hesitated. Having finally, as he believed, the divine sanction for the undertaking, the party, now numbering four, since St. Luke had joined it, set sail for Macedonia, and the Gospel was carried to Europe, a new continent—a continent, too, destined to be for many centuries in a peculiar sense Christianity's home.

All Christians are familiar, from the pages of the Book of the Acts, with the story of the founding of the churches at Philippi, Thessalonica, and Beræa, the story of St. Paul's

⁴ See Ramsay, *St. Paul, the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, pp. 200 f.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

visit to Athens, where, as Ramsay has shown, his address was not so much a sermon as a trial lecture to see whether the city fathers would permit him to become a licensed teacher of philosophy in what we might call the University of Athens. We are familiar also with the story of St. Paul's arrival in Corinth, and his sojourn of eighteen months there, during which he established himself as a business partner of a Roman Jew, Aquila by name, who had recently left Rome because Claudius had decreed that Jews should leave that city and had deprived them of the right of assemblage. In all these towns St. Paul preached in the Jewish congregations until, because of his attitude toward the Jewish law, he was driven out; then he turned to the Gentiles. At Thessalonica the Jewish opposition was particularly strong and necessitated his leaving the city prematurely. These things are so well known that we need not dwell upon them.

Of the events of this eighteen months at Corinth, mention may be made here of but two. St. Paul had arrived at Corinth alone in the autumn of the year 50 A. D. St. Luke had remained at Philippi and, when St. Paul started southward from Beræa for Athens, he had sent Silas and Timothy back to Thessalonica to see how the infant church there was enduring the bitter persecution inflicted upon it by its Jewish brethren. St. Paul was well established in Corinth with Aquila and his wife Priscilla before Silas and Timothy rejoined him. The news they brought led him to write his first Epistle to the Thessalonians. It appeared that the Thessalonian Christians were enduring persecution nobly and were unshaken in their Christian faith. They had not, however, fully under-

SECOND MISSIONARY JOURNEY

stood the high ethical demands of the Christian life, and some of them were in deep trouble on account of the death of Christian members of their families. They had been led to believe that Christ was coming at once to establish his kingdom and, as their kinsfolk had died before that coming, they had, they thought, forever lost the opportunity of sharing its happiness and its rewards. St. Paul in his letter, after tenderly commending their Christian constancy, addressed himself to these two questions. In the clearest language he set before them the Christian standard of pure family life, and then went on to explain that "we who are alive and are left unto the coming of the Lord" will be no better off than the Christians who have died, for when the Lord descends from heaven, deceased Christians will first rise from the dead to meet him, and that then we, the living, shall be caught up with them to meet the Lord in the air, so that both shall forever be with the Lord.⁵

The effect of this letter on the Thessalonians must have been a surprise to St. Paul. It gave the Thessalonians the impression that the return of the Master was very, very imminent. That impression was heightened by some Christian in their congregation who, claiming to be inspired by the Spirit, prophesied that it was indeed so. Another went so far as to forge a letter in St. Paul's name, declaring that it was truly so. The result was that some Thessalonian Christians stopped working and spent their time lounging and gossiping and waiting for the happy day. This history was in 1843 repeated in some places in our own country. The leader of the Millerites, as the Second Adventists

⁵ 1 Thes. 4: 13 ff.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

were then called, had set the nineteenth of October of that year as the day when Christ would come again, and, as the nineteenth of October approached, in one New England town where lived a woman with whom I talked in my boyhood, shopkeepers abandoned their shops, threw the doors open, and invited the public to go in and help themselves. These people were so sure of the coming of Christ, that they never expected to need or to be able to sell their goods again.

This situation in Thessalonica compelled St. Paul, within three or four months of the date of his first letter, to write to the Thessalonians again. The burden of his second letter was that the return of Christ was not as imminent as they had supposed; that he could not come until the man of sin (the Roman Empire) had fully manifested its opposition to God, and that that could not be as long as Claudius reigned, for Claudius, by his friendliness to Jewish worship, was restraining the full manifestation of the sacrilegious character of Rome's religious pretensions. (St. Paul does not put it as plainly as I have done, but that is apparently what his language means.)

This correspondence reveals that St. Paul, twenty years after his conversion, still held in all its literalness that philosophy of history which the first Christians had taken over from Judaism. There is reason to believe that he later, in some respects at least, modified these views.

The other incident of St. Paul's Corinthian ministry to arrest the attention is the coming of Gallio, brother of the Roman philosopher Seneca, to Corinth as proconsul of Achaia. Soon after his arrival, as we learn from Acts 18:12 ff., the Jews of Corinth haled St. Paul before

ST. PAUL AT CORINTH

Gallio and endeavored to persuade him to forbid the preaching of the Gospel. Doubtless they hoped to convince the proconsul that St. Paul was preaching a religion not allowed by Roman law. Paul was, however, obviously a Jew; Jesus, concerning whom he preached, was undeniably a Jew, so Gallio dismissed the case as one that had no standing before a Roman tribunal. This decision seems to have given St. Paul a new estimate of the possible place of the Roman government in the divine order of things. Whereas in second Thessalonians, written a few months before his contact with Gallio, he still thought of the Roman power as the "man of sin" of which Caligula had been the exemplar, when some years later he wrote to the Romans, the "powers that be," he declared, "are ordained of God" (Rom. 13:1 ff.). The experience with Gallio had apparently softened some of the fierceness of his Jewish point of view.

To the modern student the coming of Gallio is important in a different way. Owing to the discovery of an inscription at Delphi a few years ago,⁶ we are now able to date the coming of Gallio to Corinth as having occurred in the summer of the year 51 A. D. This fixes for us the date of St. Paul's eighteen months at Corinth between the autumn of the year 50 and the spring of the year 52 A. D., and is one reason for placing the Apostolic Council of Acts 15 in the year 49 A. D.

When St. Paul thought the Corinthian Church sufficiently established to stand on its own feet, he left that town with Aquila and Priscilla and crossed the Ægean to Ephesus.

⁶ See Deissmann, *St. Paul*, pp. 261 ff. or G. A. Barton, *Archæology and the Bible*, 6th ed., pp. 555 ff.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

Aquila and Priscilla remained there, but St. Paul, still not quite sure that the Lord would have him work in Ephesus, made a trip to Jerusalem, probably to attend one of the feasts, visited Antioch again, and made another trip through Galatia, finally returning to Ephesus to settle down for a sojourn of three years. He started for Jerusalem in the year 52 and it was apparently 54 before he returned to Ephesus. St. Luke gives us no details of the intervening two years. So as far as our knowledge of details go, the difference between the second and third missionary journeys is mainly the difference between residence at Corinth and residence at Ephesus.

V

While St. Paul had been in the east before he settled down at Ephesus, Priscilla and Aquila had made a new convert to the faith, who was destined, in my opinion, to wield a far greater influence in Christianity than is usually suspected. This new convert was none other than Apollos, a scholarly Jew from Alexandria, who had ardently embraced the faith of the sect of John the Baptist. It will be a surprise to some that the followers of the Baptist still existed as a distinct group among the Jews, but the researches of recent years have fully confirmed the statement of Acts 18:25 that such was the case. Indeed this sect, in the opinion of some scholars, played a far more important rôle during the early centuries of our era than has been suspected. Apollos had received baptism from the followers of the Baptist and was eagerly awaiting the Messiah. Priscilla and Aquila convinced him that in Jesus

APOLLOS

the Messiah had already come. He thereupon entered heartily into Christian work, laboring faithfully to convince men that Jesus was indeed the Christ, and won a place of such prominence that he is ranked almost with the Apostles.

Apollos was indeed a notable man. St. Luke describes him as *λόγιος*, which the Authorized Version renders "eloquent," but which is more correctly rendered "learned" or "scholarly." He arrived at Ephesus apparently in the year 53 A. D., when he would be presumably at least forty years old. He must, then, have been growing up in Alexandria when Philo, the Jewish philosopher, who lived until the year 40 A. D., was at the the height of his fame, and there is good reason to believe that he had drunk deeply at Philo's fountain, if he had not been an actual pupil of that master. Two characteristics of Philo's method of teaching can, I believe, be traced to Apollos, delight in allegory, and a peculiar way of accounting for the genius of eminent, God-commissioned men. Allegory Apollos did not need to introduce to Christian use, as it was already employed by St. Paul. All Jews had in a degree employed it since the days of Hosea, the prophet. If Apollos was, as some suspect, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, he has left us the most consummate specimens of allegory in the New Testament.

After Apollos had labored at Ephesus for a time, he desired to go across to Corinth to labor in the Christian Church there. Aquila and Priscilla encouraged him and gave him letters of introduction. Of the results of his labors there, we hear in St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, of which notice will be taken later. At this

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

point I want to emphasize what I believe to be Apollos' contribution to our Gospel narratives. For more than ten years I have believed that it was he who first raised the question whether God heralded the advent of Jesus by miracles and marvels, and who wrote the earliest account of our Lord's Birth—that embodied in the Gospel of Luke. The reasons for attributing this infancy narrative to Apollos were set forth by me more than ten years ago,⁷ and have been embodied by Dr. Elwood Worcester in his *Studies in the Birth of our Lord*. They may be briefly stated as follows. Philo regarded Isaac and Samuel as begotten of divine seed because God was said to have directly intervened to make it possible for their mothers to bear sons. Philo also regarded the birth of Gershom, the son of Moses, as a virgin birth, because it is not said in Exodus 2:21, 22 that Moses "went in" to Zipporah, his wife. While in all these cases Philo counts the birth a miraculous one, and uses such phrases as "begotten of divine seed," he nevertheless continued to speak of Abraham, Moses, and Elkanah as the fathers of their respective sons. Readers of St. Luke have often been puzzled because the narrative represents Mary as calling Joseph Jesus' father, and refers to Joseph and Mary as "his parents." Some scholars have gone so far as to suppose that the verses attributing to Jesus a Virgin Birth are, on this account, a later addition to the narrative. All difficulty, however, disappears if we recognize that our narrative is written from the Philonic point of view—a point of view that did not regard divine and human parentage as mutually exclusive. If written by a disciple of Philo, the

⁷ *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLIII, 1924, pp. 210 ff.

APOLLOS

narrative with one possible exception is consistent as it stands.

A still stronger argument for connecting this narrative with Apollos is its interest in the birth of John the Baptist. It makes the birth of the Forerunner almost as miraculous as that of the Messiah. Who but Apollos, of all the known Christians of the Apostolic Age, would be likely to do that? Apollos is the only name that we know of a prominent Christian who had come into the Church from the sect of the Baptist. We do hear that there were a dozen others (Acts 19:1-6) but their names are not given, and we are told no more of them.

Apollos is said to have been "mighty in the scriptures"—a description that suits well the author of the first two chapters of Luke, which are saturated with the Old Testament. Indeed, these chapters are the work of no tyro, but of a man of consummate ability. They are no plain narrative, but are great literature. The Benedictus, the Magnificat, the Song of the Angels, the Nunc Dimittis, poems that have voiced the worship of the Church for centuries, are poems of a high order, though saturated with Old Testament reminiscences. Each enters so appropriately into the situation for which it was written as to reveal an author of rare gifts of insight and expression. The Gospel of Luke, because of the presence of these poems in it, has been called "the Gospel of poetry," but, if I am not mistaken, the poet was Apollos and not Luke.

We cannot prove it, but it seems a plausible conjecture that, before his conversion, Apollos had been to Palestine and had been won by the sect of the Baptists to membership with them. There he had heard the story that John

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

was the only child of Zacharias and Elizabeth, and a child born long after this marriage and, with the teachings of Philo in mind, at once added John to Philo's list of men born of "divine seed." Later, when he had become a Christian, he inquired of the original disciples what they had heard of the birth of Christ. Possibly, on a visit to Jerusalem, he had conversed with our Lord's mother herself, for, while we have no mention of her in the New Testament after the year 30 (see Acts 1:14), she may have lived until after the conversion of Apollos. Reasons will be adduced at a later point for thinking that Apollos had composed his narrative before the year 60 A. D., when the Virgin Mary would, if living, be a little over eighty years of age. Most of the reconstructions of the history of the Apostolic Age are conjectural, and I frankly confess that this theory of Apollos belongs to the same class. Because it is presented as a conjecture, and not with the cocksureness of certainty with which some scholars present conjectural results, it is, I assure you, quite as worthy of acceptance as are many of theirs. If it is right, it gives us the clue as to when and by whom the interest of the Church was turned to the question of how Christ came into the world, and gives us a date within the first thirty years of Gospel history, when an attempt was made to answer the question. At a later point we shall have to note other influences from Philo that Apollos seems to have brought into the Apostolic circle.

VI

We must now return to St. Paul's three years at Ephesus. St. Luke gives in the nineteenth chapter of the

ST. PAUL AT EPHESUS

Acts a brief account of it, from which we learn that, as usual in a new field, he preached for three months in the Jewish synagogue, that the usual bitter opposition on the part of some Jews arose, that he then "taught daily in the school of Tyrannus," that others carried the message they had learned from him until "all Asia" heard the word of God, that a number of Jewish exorcists were converted and burned their magical books, and that so many of the heathen were converted that it interfered with the trade of the silversmiths, who made little shrines of the goddess Artemis for sale to pilgrims to her Ephesian temple. This last caused a riot, fomented by those whose trade had been ruined, the quelling of which St. Luke describes at some length. We know, too, that it was during this period of St. Paul's life that he wrote his Epistles to the Corinthians. These letters reveal the development and the solution of a crisis in the relations of the Apostle with his Corinthian disciples, which cost him much sorrow and anxiety. But apparently St. Luke does not tell all that happened during these three years. There are vague hints of other and greater dangers. It appears from Acts 20:33, a part of St. Paul's farewell to the Ephesian elders, that the Apostle had been accused by some of insincerity—of preaching for what he could make out of it. It is hinted in Acts 19:37 that he had been accused of robbing temples, which, in the eyes of the Government would be a serious charge. His remark (2 Cor. 11:23) that he had been in prisons "more abundantly" than others, seems to hint at one or more imprisonments at Ephesus. Some find confirmation of this in the fact that the site of the "prison of St. Paul" is still pointed out to one who visits the site

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

of Ephesus. But there are still darker hints. In 1 Cor. 15:32 St. Paul says, "If, after the manner of men, I fought with beasts at Ephesus." Had he actually been thrown to the beasts in the arena, or was he speaking figuratively of contentions with implacable human enemies? In 2 Cor. 1:8 he speaks of having been "so weighed down in Asia that he despaired even of life," and in Rom. 16:3, 4 he makes reference to the fact that Priscilla and Aquila had endangered their own lives to save his. From all this it is quite clear that St. Luke has not told us the whole story of St. Paul's Ephesian sojourn, that his life was in danger while there, that he was perhaps imprisoned more than once, that possibly on a charge of robbing temples he had been thrown to the lions in the arena and had somehow escaped.

There are some scholars (Deissmann, Goguel and Professor George S. Duncan⁸ of St. Andrews) who regard an Ephesian imprisonment of St. Paul as practically an established fact, and who think that it was during that imprisonment that St. Paul's letters to the Philippians, Philemon, and Colossians were written. Because St. Paul in Philemon 22 asked Philemon to prepare for him a lodging because he hoped to be released, it is argued that he must have been writing from Ephesus, which was only 125 miles from Colossae, and could not have been writing from distant Rome. Similarly, because in the Epistle to the Philippians the fact is revealed that, after Epaphroditus had arrived with a gift of money for St. Paul and had fallen ill, four journeys had been made between Philippi and the place of St. Paul's imprisonment before

⁸ See his *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry*, New York, 1930.

ST. PAUL AT EPHEBUS

St. Paul composed his letter, it is argued that the place of imprisonment is far more likely to have been Ephesus than far-off Rome. Such arguments are, however, not convincing. Suppose it were reported that the Archbishop of Canterbury were in New York and that a church in St. Louis sent him a gift of money, and that in New York he fell in with the profligate son of an old friend of his who happened to be living in Denver, one could not prove that the New York tradition must be wrong and that the Archbishop must have been in Chicago, when these experiences happened to him, because Chicago is so much nearer to St. Louis and Denver than New York is! To me the arguments for supposing that St. Paul's Epistles of the imprisonment were written from Ephesus seem no more convincing. Further, the thought of St. Paul expressed in the Epistles of the imprisonment reveals a theology so much more developed than the theology of the Corinthian Epistles that I cannot believe that all these letters were contemporaneous. If a period of four or five years had intervened and the Apostle had been confronted with new theological problems, the difference in thought is intelligible. The supposition, therefore, which has long prevailed among scholars, that the Epistles of the imprisonment were written from Rome, still seems to me to represent the truth. That St. Paul was imprisoned while at Ephesus, perhaps more than once, is altogether probable; that somehow his life was endangered and that Priscilla and Aquila risked their lives to save him, seems certain. More than this we cannot say. The details completely elude us.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

VII

In 2 Cor. 11:28 St. Paul concludes the catalogue of the hardships which he bore for Christ's sake, with "anxiety for all the churches." He further explains it by indicating with what ardent sympathy he entered into all their weaknesses and errors. In our brief review of the Galatian and Thessalonian letters we have already seen what that could mean to him. During his Ephesian ministry events occurred which called forth from him four letters to the Church at Corinth, and, as the last two of these letters show, some of these events cut him to the quick.

The first of these letters to the Corinthians, now preserved in substance in our 2 Cor. 6:14-7:1, was a simple exhortation to the Corinthian Christians to keep themselves free from the entanglements of heathen society, and especially not to contract marriages with idolaters. On the Lachæum Road in Corinth, not far from the meeting-place of the first Christian Church there, stood the temple of Apollo, the influences of which penetrated family and social life in various ways. On Acro-Corinthus, which lifted its head some five hundred feet a couple of miles away, stood the temple of Aphrodite, the immoral character of some of whose rites fostered a social ethic utterly subversive of Christian purity. It was natural that the great Apostle should labor to keep his converts free from such corruption. His first letter, although somewhat misunderstood, seems to have been well received (see 1 Cor. 5:9).

LETTERS TO CORINTH

The trouble began after he had written them his second letter, our First Corinthians. That letter was called forth by a number of circumstances. We have already noted how Apollos went to Corinth to labor, while St. Paul was in the east. St. Paul describes himself as "rude in speech"; Apollos was eloquent, polished, and seemed more philosophical. Greeks, who especially appreciated such abilities, enthusiastically lauded him as greater than Paul. Some, who valued St. Paul's sterling qualities above such brilliant gifts, resented the implied slur to the beloved founder of their church. Thus two parties were formed. St. Peter, accompanied by his wife, appears also to have visited Corinth. The fact that he had known Jesus personally—had actually lived with him—gave St. Peter great prestige with some, and soon a Peter party was formed. The unity and harmony of the church was endangered. Then one of the Corinthian Christians had married his stepmother—an act which scandalized both Jews and Greeks. St. Paul's letter to them about marriage, too, had led the Corinthians to write and ask him if he thought Christians ought to marry at all. They appear also to have asked him whether it was wrong to eat meat that had been given in sacrifice to idols, some of which was often sold in Corinthian markets. St. Paul had also heard that there was at Corinth unbrotherly conduct at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and, at their meetings for worship, such an eagerness on the part of each to display his spiritual gifts was manifested that the result was unedifying disorder. Finally he had heard that some of them denied that the dead could rise again. As St.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

Paul treated all these questions in the letter which now lies before us as First Corinthians, it is the most miscellaneous of all his Epistles.

One part of this letter caused trouble. St. Paul had advised (1 Cor. 5) that the Corinthians hold a church meeting and expel the man who had married his step-mother until such time as he should repent. This man had friends in the Church. Apparently he belonged to a party of *perfecti*, such as we traced in Galatia, who regarded a Christian as above all moral standards. These people not only refused to follow St. Paul's advice, but in various ways belittled him and slandered him. When St. Paul heard of it, he sent Titus, who had now joined him in Ephesus, across to Corinth along with an unnamed brother (2 Cor. 12:18) to try to bring the Corinthians to a Christian attitude in the whole matter, but Titus failed. St. Paul himself then left Ephesus and made a brief visit to Corinth to try by his personal presence and authority to redeem the Church from its dangerous position, but, after he returned to Ephesus, he knew that the chief effect of his effort had been to give them the opportunity to say, "His letters are weighty and strong; but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech of no account" (2 Cor. 10:10).

Under these circumstances the Apostle determined to make a final effort. He wrote them a letter of appeal, as he himself says, "out of much affliction and anguish of heart . . . with many tears" (2 Cor. 2:4), and sent Titus again to Corinth to plead with the Corinthians. That letter (or the bulk of it) is now preserved in chapters ten to thirteen of our Second Epistle to the Corinthians. When

LETTERS TO CORINTH

this letter was penned, St. Paul had determined to bring his labors at Ephesus to an end. He had arranged to leave that city and labor for a time in Troas, where he arranged that Titus should rejoin him and make report as to his mission. The Corinthian situation, however, so preyed upon his mind that he could think of nothing else. As Titus was to return overland, by way of Macedonia, St. Paul left Troas, and crossed over, probably to Philippi. Here Titus joined him and reported that at last the Corinthians were penitent, that they had come to the Apostle's way of thinking and were deeply sorry for all the hard things they had said of him. On receipt of this information, St. Paul was so overjoyed that he sat down and wrote his fourth Epistle to the Corinthians, which we now possess in our 2 Cor., chapters one to nine. This episode illustrates what "anxiety for the churches" meant to an Apostle.

For more than a year before St. Paul left Ephesus he had been planning to have the churches he had founded around the Ægean perform an effective and appealing act of brotherhood to the Church at Jerusalem. Jerusalem has never been an industrial city, where one could easily earn a living. Down to the present day its chief industry is the entertaining of pilgrims and tourists. Such capital as the Jerusalem Christians had had they had consumed years before in their communistic experiment. All through the New Testament period they were "the poor saints" at Jerusalem. St. Paul knew that "money talks." We sometimes think that it speaks more eloquently to the Jew than to others; but we are all very sensitive to its utterances. The converts who had been won to Christ on

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

both sides of the Ægean were nearly all poor. "Not many mighty, not many noble" had been called. They were laborers, small traders, and such like people. To secure from congregations made up of such people a substantial sum of money, required time and insight and tact. To accomplish it St. Paul instituted a systematic plan of giving. Members of the different churches were to lay by a small sum each week, according as the Lord had prospered them. Had envelopes only been invented then, it would be the earliest instance of the envelope system on record. The eighth and ninth chapters of Second Corinthians, which really are the concluding chapters of his four letters to that church, are devoted to directions for completing this fund. Any modern churchman who has to raise money can gain points in the psychology of the art from reading St. Paul's arguments. In money-raising, as in everything he undertook, he was a master.

VIII

After writing his fourth Epistle to the Corinthians from Macedonia, St. Paul proceeded from church to church until in the late autumn of the year 57 he arrived at Corinth. There he spent the three winter months, and there he wrote his Epistle to the Romans. An Epistle to the Romans presupposes the existence of a church at Rome, but how came it that there was a church at Rome? Who founded it? And when? Most scholars have regarded these questions as unanswerable, but in my opinion something of the obscurity surrounding the subject may be penetrated, and a genuine view of the way in

THE CHURCH AT ROME

which a church came to be established, in what was then the capital of the world, can with great probability be discerned.

From Acts 18:2 we learn that Aquila and Priscilla had left Rome in 50 A. D. because Claudius had ordered all Jews out of the city. That Claudius issued such a decree is confirmed by Suetonius and Dio Cassius, and by Orosius, a fifth-century writer. Orosius dates the edict in the ninth year of Claudius, which would make it the year 49 or 50, which agrees with the statement in Acts. Dio Cassius says that the decree was not enforced because of the great numbers of Jews in Rome, and that Claudius contented himself finally with forbidding Jewish assemblies.⁹ If they could not assemble, the Jews were denied the free exercise of their religion, and doubtless many, like Aquila and Priscilla, did actually leave the city.

As the method of propagating Christianity was at this time by preaching in Jewish synagogues, it is therefore altogether improbable that Christianity was established in Rome during the reign of Claudius. That emperor died and was succeeded by Nero in October of the year 54, about the time St. Paul was arriving in Ephesus for his stay of three years. After news of the accession of a new emperor reached the East, no Jews could return to Rome thence until navigation opened in the year 55, and it is quite possible that they would wait another year to hear whether the new emperor enforced the edict against the right of assemblage. By the year 56, however, the way was open, and for some years I have held the theory¹⁰ that

⁹ See K. Lake's discussion, *Beginnings of Christianity*, V, 459 f.

¹⁰ See *Expository Times*, XLIII (May, 1932), 359 f.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

two Jewish Christians, Andronicus and Junius, who had been with St. Paul in Ephesus and had shared one of his imprisonments there, then went to Rome and established that church. In Romans 16:7 St. Paul sends his salutation to them, refers to them as Jews and as his fellow prisoners, and speaks of them as "of note among the Apostles." We never hear of them afterward, but what could have given them greater note than to have founded the church in the eternal city, a field of labor to which St. Paul had himself looked with longing eyes?

I am well aware that for many years it has been the fashion in some scholarly circles to deny that the sixteenth chapter of Romans was originally a part of that epistle, and to regard it as a letter introducing one Phœbe to the church at Ephesus. The reasons for this view are that so many of the people greeted in the letter, like Aquila and Priscilla, were at Ephesus only a short time before. The adherents of that theory seem to me to fail to use their imaginations, and they offer no explanation as to how the chapter, if written to the Ephesians, got attached to the Epistle to the Romans. Phœbe was probably the messenger who carried St. Paul's letter to Rome. We have already noted much evidence as to the difficulties encountered by St. Paul and his helpers in Ephesus, and, if Andronicus and Junius had established a Christian congregation in Rome by the years 56, what more natural than for Aquila and Priscilla to flee persecution and to return to their old home? What more natural than for other persecuted Christians to leave Ephesus and to go with them? It was somehow thus, I believe, that the Church of Rome came into existence.

THE CHURCH AT ROME

IX

St. Paul's experience with Jews and Judaizers led him to realize the importance of having his liberal view of Christianity understood and, if possible, accepted at Rome. At the moment he could not go there in person; he was committed to go with the delegates elected by the Ægean churches to carry their contribution and brotherly offering to the Mother Church at Jerusalem. He accordingly sat down and indited the Epistle to the Romans. The theme of his Epistle is that in Christ there is revealed a righteousness of God by faith apart from the law. The argument is the argument he employed to the Galatians nine or ten years before, but now there are no charges to be repelled, no renegades to be chided, and he sets forth his ideas expansively and without passion. It is the longest and most treatise-like letter that we have from his pen. It was composed in order, if possible, to persuade the church, which St. Paul believed would become the most influential church in the world, not to make the mistake of advocating a Christianity that would constitute only a Jewish sect, but to become the herald of a message meant for all mankind.

The letter ended, St. Paul was ready with his fellow delegates to start for Jerusalem.¹¹

¹¹ At some time during the period between 43 and 64 A. D. the document M, which was employed by St. Matthew alone of all the evangelists, was written. Its author belonged to the Jewish party, as is shown by Matt. 5: 17-19.

IV

THE PASSING OF THE APOSTLES

I

AT the end of the last lecture we left St. Paul at Corinth ready to start for Jerusalem to carry, along with delegates from local churches, a token of good will in the form of a gift of money to the Mother Church of Christendom. This gift would, he hoped, be accepted as a token of Christian brotherhood that would tend to allay the suspicions of the Jewish Christians and so help to bind the whole Christian fellowship firmly together in conscious unity as devoted servants of Jesus Christ.

It had been the Apostle's plan to sail from Canchreae, the port four miles east of Corinth, on the other side of the isthmus. It was, however, discovered that some Jews had formed a plot to kill him during the voyage and apparently take such of the funds as St. Paul might have with him. Doubtless these Jews felt that such an act would be a service to God as well as a means of enriching themselves. Jewish Christians, like James, John, and Peter, might understand the logic which led St. Paul to disregard the law and teach Gentiles to do so, but non-Christian Jews could not be expected to share that view. To them, as to St. Paul in his earlier days, the law was the one ex-

JERUSALEM AND IMPRISONMENT

pression of God's will, and to disregard it was a most heinous sin.

Under these circumstances, then, St. Paul prudently changed his plan and traveled by land through Thessaly, Thrace, and Macedonia, around the Ægean, and came down its eastern coast by way of Troas, past Ephesus to Miletus. At various points on this journey delegates from churches in various cities joined him, and at Philippi St. Luke attached himself to the company, to remain with the Apostle apparently until the end of his Roman imprisonment. Elders of the church at Ephesus came to Miletus to take their leave of St. Paul, and in the twentieth chapter of Acts, St. Luke gives the substance of the Apostle's farewell address to them. It seems unnecessary to recount here the events which are told with so much detail in the concluding chapters of the book of Acts, the frequent reading of which has made them so familiar to us all. We recall the affectionate hospitality that was extended to the company at Tyre and Ptolemais; the stay at Caesarea, during which vain efforts were made to persuade St. Paul not to go to Jerusalem; the plan St. Paul adopted after his arrival in Jerusalem, at the suggestion of St. James, by which it was hoped to persuade all Jews that St. Paul was still loyal to the traditions and customs of his race; the false cry raised by an Ephesian Jew, who recognized St. Paul in the temple court, that caused a mob to attempt to kill him. We recall also how the chief captain arrested St. Paul to save his life, how forty men after that bound themselves by an oath not to eat or drink until they had slain him; how the chief captain, to save his life, sent him by night to Caesarea; how at his hearing before Felix he in-

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

advertently stated that he had come to bring alms to his nation and how Felix, thinking that a man who could give alms to a nation could find money with which to buy his liberty, kept him a prisoner for two years, and then, to please the Jews, left him a prisoner whose fate was to be settled by his successor Festus; and how St. Paul, in order to escape certain death at the hands of the Jews at Jerusalem, exercised his right as a Roman citizen and appealed to the emperor's tribunal at Rome. The story of his voyage and shipwreck, of his arrival in Rome, and of his "two whole years in his own hired house" (possibly to be translated "two whole years on his own earnings") are familiar to us all.

The events just sketched occupied five years, years that were eventful and that left their mark both upon St. Paul and the Church. Unfortunately our written records give us only passing glimpses of them. During the two years of the Apostle's imprisonment at Caesarea St. Luke appears to have been a resident there also. Apparently as a free man he remained near his friend in order to render him such service as he might. What these years meant to St. Luke I shall try to state at a later point. Of the workings of St. Paul's mind during these two years, we have no record. That his grasp of the meaning of the work of Jesus Christ and its adequacy for all the needs of mankind was growing, is made manifest by his later letters.

II

During the Apostle's residence of two years in Rome, events occurred which called forth from him three letters,

EPISTLES FROM ROME

one to the Philippians, one to Philemon, and one to the Colossians. These letters tell us both something of the forces at work in the Church and something of St. Paul. The Philippian letter was occasioned by the fact that the church at Philippi had sent St. Paul a contribution of money by a messenger named Epaphroditus, who, after arriving in Rome, was attacked by a serious illness. In it the Apostle tells them of his situation in Rome and how in consequence of it the Gospel was being proclaimed and was being accepted. It was being made known throughout the whole pretorian guard. St. Paul, though living in his own hired dwelling, was apparently chained to a soldier, who was responsible for him.¹ Being an inveterate preacher, no soldier could be chained to him without receiving the Christian message. Modern hearers, when they tire of the sermon, can get up and go out, but St. Paul was during these years always sure of a congregation of one who was compelled to listen. From time to time the soldiers were changed, and thus Christianity gradually penetrated the pretorian guard. St. Paul was looking forward to an early release, and was very hopeful that he would be released.

To such a degree did the great Apostle feel responsibility for the welfare of all his spiritual offspring, that he could not write a letter of thanks without taking the opportunity to give pastoral advice. At Philippi, as in most churches, there was not perfect harmony in the congregation. Some Christians thought themselves better than others and held themselves aloof; this was resented by those who were looked down upon, and ill feeling and

¹ See Acts 28:20.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

disunity was the result. In addressing himself to this situation, St. Paul urged them to imitate the example of Christ, and, in so doing, was led to give the most explicit statement of the process of the incarnation that we have from his pen (see Phil. 2:5-11). It is clear as one reads it that he was consciously drawing the contrasting parallel between Adam and Christ of which he was so fond. Adam was made in the image of God, was tempted to grasp at equality with God and, in consequence, was expelled from Eden. "Christ," says St. Paul, "being in the form of God, thought it not something to be grasped at to be equal with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men." That was his first act of self-abnegation, to become incarnate. Then, "being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient to death, even the death of the cross." That was the second act of self-renunciation. Because of these two acts of humility, "God highly exalted him and gave unto him the name that is above every name." That is, he gave him God's own name, Yahweh, or Jehovah—the name that both the Greek and English Scriptures render by the name "LORD" (KURIOS). In no stronger way could a Jew avow his belief in the divine character of Jesus. To the essence indicated by this divine name, regarded in St. Paul's time as too sacred to be uttered, St. Paul refers when he goes on to say that it is God's purpose that every tongue shall confess Jesus LORD. The passage shows us the workings of the Apostle's mind on the mystery of the incarnation, and opens a number of most interesting problems, which it is not possible in this connection to discuss.

The Epistle also shows that the friction between the

EPISTLES FROM ROME

Jewish school of thought and the liberals in early Christianity, of which St. Paul was the leader, dogged the Apostle's footsteps to the end of his life. He found it necessary to warn the Philippians against Judaizers, and in so doing pointed out how he himself, though possessing all the advantages of the most exclusive Jewish orthodoxy, had renounced it all for Christ. Then, fearing that he had seemed to boast, he gave expression to one of the most beautiful attitudes of Christian humility and consecration on record:

Not that I have already obtained or am already made perfect: but I press on, if so be that I may lay hold of that for which I was laid hold of by Christ Jesus. . . . Forgetting the things that are behind, and stretching forward to the things that are before, I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

Such was the attitude of this Christian hero who, more than any other, influenced the trend of the early Apostolic Age and through it the Christianity of all time, as after twenty-three years of arduous service in which he had always "lived dangerously" he faced the threshold of the eternal life.

III

The Epistle to the Colossians was called forth by a different situation, and one that gives us a still more interesting glimpse of forces at work in early Christianity and of the flexibility and growth of the Apostle's thought. To understand the underlying forces one must in thought make a brief historical retrospect. As early as the eighth

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

century before Christ the conquests and deportations of the Assyrian Empire began the mingling of people with people and culture with culture. This was continued by the Babylonians. Then for two hundred years the Persians united under one government peoples from India to the Ægean. Darius I even invaded India. Alexander the Great repeated his achievement, and under his successors a common language was understood from Greece to the Punjab. As a result, peoples who had believed that their own culture and religion contained all the truth began to see the values of other cultures and religions. Asoka, king of Magadha in India, had, before 250 B. C., sent Buddhist missionaries to Syria, Egypt, Macedonia, Epirus, and Cyrene. As a result of all this intermingling, there began to spring up before the time of Christ eclectic systems of thought in which, just as in Christian Science, New Thought, and similar cults of our own time, it was sought to combine the best of various national systems. This mixture was often based on the Persian conception of a good and an evil god, who were struggling for the control of the universe. It usually contained some Babylonian conceptions, and sometimes appropriated the Indian conception of the transmigration of souls. One of the conceptions to which it gave birth was that of a primal or heavenly man—a conception which figures in *Poimandres*, one of the *Hermetic* writings of Egypt. This conception had already been borrowed by orthodox Judaism, and figures in the Books of Daniel and Enoch as the Son of Man. In another form it had before the Christian era invaded Judaism and called into existence the semi-ascetic sect of the Essenes. In still another form it invaded both heathen-

EPISTLES FROM ROME

ism and early Christianity, and created sects which held that salvation was to be obtained by knowledge rather than by faith. In early Christian history these sects are known as gnostics. It was at Colossae in the time of St. Paul's imprisonment that this type of thought first manifested itself among Christians, and at Colossae it was mingled with Judaism and came in apparently as a part of the anti-Pauline Jewish propaganda. According to this teaching, the world was made by the god of evil: the soul is a spark from the god of good that has become embodied in a material body which, because it is material, is corrupt. The systems varied, but the method of this embodiment was, generally speaking, somehow thus: from God there emanated Logos and Sophia (Word and Wisdom) from these Pleroma and Bathus (Fullness and Depth) and from these another pair, and so on. In some systems there were few of these syzygies, as the pairs were called, in others, many. It was believed that the soul should know how it got enmeshed in matter, in order to know how to find its way out. Escape from this enmeshment was salvation. Many gnostic systems were ascetic, as one might expect. At Colossae this asceticism took the form of strict obedience to the Jewish law.

It was to counteract this teaching that St. Paul wrote his letter to the Colossians, and it is most instructive to see how he did it. He reinterpreted Christ and his work in a way which, if accepted, would cut the ground from under the gnostic thought. "Christ," he declares, "is the image of the unseen God; he is the firstborn of all creation, because all things in the heavens and on the earth were created by him, things seen and unseen, whether thrones

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

or lordships, or principalities or authorities—all things were created through him and unto him, and he is before all things and in him all things consist (or hold together).” Again he says that it pleased (God) that in him all fullness (*Pleroma*) should dwell (Col. 1:15-17). Again (Col. 2:9, 10) he declares, “In him (Christ) dwells all the fullness of the godhead bodily, and in him are ye made full, who is the head of all principality (*archè*) and authority (*exousia*).” Among the syzigies at Colossae, Pleroma, Archè, and Exousia bore prominent places.

St. Paul here declares that Christ is God’s firstborn. There is no room for Logos and Sophia. If they exist they exist in him. All things in heaven and earth were made by him. The world is not the work of an evil deity; God created it through his Son. In him all things consist; Christ is the world-soul, so to speak, the vital force which holds the universe together. All the fullness of the godhead dwells in him. If you seek to be touched by divine fullness, it is possible through him to have the experience. St. Paul does not, like some later writers, fall back on denunciation, tradition, and church authority, but interprets Christ so as to make him appear to be the agent for the correction of their errors in thought, and the vehicle through whom all their aspirations for the ineffable might be attained.

One cannot compare these utterances about Christ with those of the Thessalonian letters, written a dozen or thirteen years before, without noting how, under the pressure of life and its problems, the Apostle’s thought had grown. Then Christ was in a heaven just above the sky and might at any time descend in bodily form. Now he is

MARTYRDOM OF JAMES

the world-soul that holds all things together. How a world-soul could get far enough from the world to need to come back, it is hard to see. Whether St. Paul ever coördinated his thoughts and let the new fully expel the old from his system of things, we do not know.

In his conception of Christ as the agent of creation, St. Paul anticipated the Logos doctrine of the author of the Fourth Gospel. St. Paul does not employ the term, but he clearly states the idea. Indeed, six or seven years before he wrote to the Colossians, he had accepted the idea, for in 1 Cor. 8:6 he speaks of "One Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things."

These epistles of the Roman imprisonment reveal the great servant of Jesus Christ, who had begun by persecuting the disciples of his Master, as growing in grace, in humility, in thought and in understanding, as well as in sacrificial service unto the very end. With the close of these epistles, the curtain falls for us on both the inner and outer life of St. Paul.

IV

While St. Paul, St. Luke, and others had been spending two years in Rome, the Mother Church at Jerusalem had had her tribulations. The Procurator Festus, one of whose first official acts in the year 60 A. D. had been to remand St. Paul to Rome to be heard by the emperor's tribunal, died in office in the spring of the year 62 A. D. About the time of his death, Herod Agrippa II, King of Chalcis, to whom the Roman government had committed the power of naming and deposing high priests, deposed a certain

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

Joseph, who was holding the office, because Joseph had built a wall in the temple area to hide the work of the sacred area from the windows of the new dining room that Agrippa had added to the palace in Jerusalem which he had inherited from his ancestors.² Agrippa appointed Annas,³ the son of the Annas, mentioned in the Gospel of John in connection with the trial of our Lord, and a brother-in-law of Caiaphas, to the office of high priest. Josephus describes this Annas as a rash, bold man. He tells us that he was a Sadducee, and that the Sadducees were much more severe in judging departures from the law than the Pharisees. In those days communication was slow. There was no telegraph or wireless. After the death of Festus three months elapsed before his successor, Albinus, could be appointed and reach Palestine. Annas, in the absence of a representative of the Roman government, determined to act boldly to rid the Holy City of some leading Christians who were obnoxious to him and such as he. He accordingly haled James the Brother of Christ, with some others of the leading Christians, before the Sanhedrin, had them condemned and put to death by stoning. Christian tradition has preserved some details of how James, a man of great piety, died.⁴ How authentic these traditions are it is impossible to say. Neither Josephus nor tradition has preserved the names of the others who thus followed James the son of Zebedee, and St. Stephen into the path of martyrdom for Christ's sake, though, as will appear directly, we are now in a position, I believe, to

² Josephus, *Ant.* XX, 8:11.

³ *Ibid.*, XX, 9:1.

⁴ Eusebius, *Ecd. History*, II, 23:3 ff. Eusebius quotes the tradition from Hegessippus.

MARTYRDOM OF JAMES

recover with a good deal of certainty the name of one of them.

In putting these men to death, Annas had exceeded his authority. The Romans had specifically kept the decision of capital cases in their own hands. Josephus tells us that many Jews were "most uneasy" at this breach of the laws, and begged Agrippa to forbid Annas to commit any such acts in the future. Others met Albinus as he entered the country, and reported to him the conduct of Annas, for which Albinus threatened to punish him. Under these circumstances Agrippa deposed Annas. There can, I think, be no doubt that those who thus protested to Agrippa and reported Annas to Albinus were Christian Jews, members of the Church at Jerusalem.

One of the Christians who were martyred along with James the Less in the summer of the year 62 A. D. was, it is now believed, the Apostle John, John the son of Zebedee. Some years ago a Dutch scholar, De Boor, recovered from a late Greek writer a fragment of Papias, which states that James and John, the sons of Zebedee, were martyred by the Jews. The martyrdom of James is recorded in the twelfth chapter of the Acts, but that of the Apostle John is specifically recorded by no other ancient authentic writing. If John was put to death by the Jews, it must have been before the year 70 A. D., for never since that date have they had authority to inflict such punishment, and, if they did it before 70 A. D., there is no occasion for the deed so probable as the summer of the year 62 A. D. It should be added that since the discovery of this De Boor fragment of Papias, discussion as to its genuineness has hotly raged. Some scholars, as the late

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

Arthur Peake, regarded it as a fabrication. The majority of New Testament scholars of weight have, however, accepted it, and the late Archdeacon Charles, in his *Commentary* on the Book of Revelation, demonstrated, I believe, its genuineness. If we would rightly portray for ourselves the events of the years we are considering, we should think that during the "two whole years" that St. Paul spent "in his own hired house" or "on his own wage" in Rome, and perhaps during the very summer, when he was writing his Epistle to the Colossians, two of the "pillar" Apostles (see Gal. 2:9), with whom he had frequently conferred through the years on Christian work, passed on before him by the painful gate of martyrdom into the other world, leaving only St. Peter still alive, of the three that were counted "pillars."

V

One of the most interesting and puzzling problems connected with New Testament history is the question, What happened to St. Paul at the end of the two years? Was he condemned and beheaded, or was he acquitted and released? On this point various theories have been held, each based on some slight but inconclusive clue.

1. The theory on which, I suppose, all of us were brought up was that he was released when his case was heard by Nero, that he was free for a time, during which he visited Crete, went to Asia again, and wrote the Epistles to Timothy and Titus. This theory rests upon the fact that tradition attributed to St. Paul the authorship of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, that there is no room for

ST. PAUL'S MARTYRDOM

them in St. Paul's life unless he was released in the year 64 A. D., that Clement of Rome, writing to the Corinthians about the year 96 A. D., speaks of St. Paul as having "preached the gospel to the uttermost bounds of the west,"⁵ and that St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans had expressed his intention of preaching in Spain.⁶ In our youth this hypothesis was generally accepted. The difficulties with it are many. If St. Paul was released and went to Spain which was in the far west, how did he evangelize Crete also and travel in the east? Clement, in the passage already referred to, alludes to the martyrdom of St. Paul, presumably under Nero. As Nero was assassinated in the year 68 A. D., and travel was then slow, it is hardly probable that, if he went west, he also went east. Since it is now generally accepted by scholars that the Epistles to Timothy and Titus are not by St. Paul, but were written to meet a later situation by one into whose hands some brief Pauline letters, written by the Apostle, had come, the difficulty of a journey to the east has been eliminated. This fact does not, however, establish the historicity of the journey to Spain, for Clement's reference is very oratorical, and the reference to the "uttermost bounds of the west" seems to many scholars of the present an exaggerated hyperbole for Rome. The theory as a whole is now generally abandoned. St. Paul's plan, which in the year 58 A. D. he entertained, to go to Spain, is no guarantee that he ever found himself in a position to carry it out.

2. There is a tradition, first mentioned in the *Acts of Paul* about 160 A. D., that St. Paul was martyred by being

⁵ I Clement, Ch. V.

⁶ Ch. 15: 24 and 28.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

beheaded with a sword. The testimony for this is late, and it may be based on nothing more than an inference from the fact that, as a Roman citizen, he had the right, if he were to be put to death by judicial order, to choose beheading to other forms of execution.

3. Eusebius, in his second book of *Chronicles*,⁷ implies that both St. Paul and St. Peter were martyred in the year 64 A. D. His words are: "Among all his injustices he [Nero] inaugurated the first persecution against the Christians, when Peter and Paul, the most godlike Apostles, were crowned as martyrs by suffering for Christ." The persecution of Nero was, apparently, a brief episode designed to deflect suspicion from the Emperor, and there is no evidence that it was prolonged through the years, and further it would seem that, when it was begun, the most prominent Christians would be executed first. It would appear probable, then, if Eusebius is to be credited at all, that the Apostles met their death in 64 A. D., the year that Rome was burned.

4. The researches of Professors Ramsay, Lake, and Cadbury concerning the outcome of St. Paul's appeal to Caesar—researches based on Roman legal procedure—while not altogether conclusive, have established a high degree of probability that St. Paul's case was never heard by the imperial tribunal, and that it lapsed and the Apostle was set free because his accusers did not appear. The fullest and latest presentation of the case for this has been made by Professor Cadbury,⁸ whose arguments may be briefly summarized as follows: (1) An appeal to the Em-

⁷ See edition of Alfred Schoene, Berlin, 1875-1876, II, 156.

⁸ *Beginnings of Christianity*, V, 319-338.

ST. PAUL'S MARTYRDOM

peror by people of the provinces was an expensive matter, as it involved the expensive transport to Rome of witnesses and professional pleaders, the equivalent of the modern lawyer. St. Paul was not put to all that expense as he always plead his own cases, and even if he had to supply his own food on the voyage to Rome, as is possible, it was not more expensive to him than his other journeys. The two whole years in Rome, *ἐν ἰδίῳ μισθώματι*, were probably years in which he was allowed liberty under some sort of guard to work at his trade, and so was able to support himself. (2) Jews, who wished to prosecute cases in Rome, did not always go to the expense of traveling thither, but sent documents to Jews resident in Rome, asking them to represent them before the tribunal. Acts 28:17-22 tells us how St. Paul, on his arrival in Rome, called together the leaders of the Jews and explained his case to them. They replied, "We neither received letters from Judæa concerning thee, nor did any of the brethren come here and speak any harm of thee." At the time of St. Paul's arrival in Rome the Judæan Jews had taken no steps to prosecute their case against the Apostle. They had not even asked a Roman Jew to appear against him. (3) A papyrus from the reign of Nero specifically states that in capital cases originating in Italy, if the accusers did not appear within nine months, the case was to be dropped. If the case originated north of the Alps, eighteen months must be allowed them. If they did not appear in that time, the case went by default and the prisoner was freed. In the correspondence between Pliny and the Emperor Trajan, in a case not altogether parallel to St. Paul's, two years were allowed. It is possible that in the time of Nero

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

two years were allowed for the presentation of evidence in cases originating beyond the sea. Our evidence is incomplete and fragmentary. It is gathered in part from the accounts of cases that are not altogether parallel to that of St. Paul. It does seem, however, to establish a probability that St. Paul remained in Rome two whole years waiting for his accusers to present the evidence against him, and that they did not do it. The legal time limit having then elapsed, the case was dismissed, and St. Paul was set free. If this is really what happened, it may justly be asked, Why did not St. Luke say so? It may be said in reply, as Dr. Cadbury has pointed out, that "two whole years" may have been an expression as well understood in such cases as "served his time" is with us. If we say a man has "served his time," we do not need to say that he was discharged. It is understood. So St. Luke may well have conveyed to his readers, who were familiar with the terms of Roman law, the fact that St. Paul's case never came to trial and that he was set free—a meaning which we have hitherto failed to grasp through ignorance of Roman legal procedure in such cases. If this be so, the conclusion of the Book of Acts is not so abrupt and puzzling as we have hitherto supposed it to be.

Dr. Cadbury, with true scholarly caution, avoids deducing from his evidence any definite conclusion. Were I to venture a hypothesis concerning the course of events, it would be that St. Paul's case was never heard by the imperial tribunal, that because the prosecution did not follow it up he was set free after two years, that for reasons which we can only conjecture he continued to live in Rome, and

ST. LUKE'S WRITINGS

that as a Christian he fell a victim to the malignity of Nero after the great fire in the year 64 A. D.

It may well be that some act of St. Paul aroused against him Nero's anger, so that he suffered martyrdom quite apart from Jewish charges or the burning of the city. If we gave any credence to later traditions, they point to this conclusion. For example, the *Acts of Paul* relate that St. Paul converted to Christianity Patroclus, a cupbearer of Nero, and that Nero, being told by Patroclus that Christ was king, had the Apostle put to death for treason. Chrysostom, on the other hand, relates that St. Paul won to Christianity a beautiful concubine of Nero's, and, when she refused to continue her unhallowed relations with the Emperor, he sentenced the Apostle to death. Of course both traditions cannot be true, but they open our eyes to the possibilities of the situation.

VI

In this lecture we have followed the fortunes of St. Paul during more than six years from his departure from Corinth in the year 58 A. D. to his martyrdom in the year 64 A. D. With St. Paul there was during most of this time a companion, St. Luke, whose personality is not vividly pictured in the pages of the New Testament, but who, according to tradition, composed our Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles—a tradition which I now believe to be valid, though for years I doubted it. We may not know much of his personality, but St. Luke was the best literary artist in the New Testament and the best writer

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

of Greek. How much we owe to him we can perhaps imagine by trying to realize how much poorer the New Testament would be without the Gospel according to Luke and the Acts of the Apostles. How was St. Luke occupying himself during these six years? Of course we cannot answer the question fully. Whether he supported himself by practising medicine or whether he had independent means, we do not know. I am, however, heretical enough, from the point of view of present scholarly opinion, to believe that one of his occupations during these years was the composition of his Gospel and the Book of Acts and that the last of them was completed sometime in the year 63 A. D. In order that this statement may not seem to be arbitrary or to rest on wilful idiosyncrasies, I must beg your indulgence for a little, while I recapitulate some of the views concerning the authorship and date of the Acts which have been held during the last fifty years.

As a preliminary to this review, let me point out that there are four sections in the Book of Acts in which the author employs the pronoun "we," implying that he was himself of St. Paul's company and participated in the events which he narrated. These passages scholars call the "we-sections." They are: Acts 16:10-16, the journey from Troas to Philippi; Acts 20:5-15, the journey from Philippi to Miletus; Acts 21:1-17, the journey from Miletus to Jerusalem; and Acts 27:1-28:16, the journey from Caesarea to Rome, including its voyage and shipwreck. It is necessary to have the fact of the "we-sections" in mind in order to understand the arguments pro and con.

In the early nineties of the last century a group of German scholars set themselves to discover in the Book of

ST. LUKE'S WRITINGS

Acts documents which its author had, they assumed, woven together. Documents had been found underlying the Pentateuch; documents had been found to underlie the Gospels of Matthew and Luke; presumably, therefore, documents underlay the Book of Acts. Its author had been the author of the Gospel of Luke, to compose which he had employed previously existing documents, and it was reasonable to suppose that in his second work he had employed the same method. As a young man I eagerly tested these analyses by working the book through in their light, and was convinced that the theory of Fredrich Spitta best accounted for the facts. According to this theory, the compiler of Acts employed two documents; one, which contained the "we-sections," was composed by St. Luke, the companion of St. Paul, the other, which gave the account of the early Church at Jerusalem, was the work of a Jewish Christian. The compiler, it was thought, wove these two documents together between 75 and 85 A. D. This date was based on the belief that Luke 21:20 was written after the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 70 A. D., and that the Acts must have been composed later.

Between 1905 and 1910 Professor Adolf Harnack wrote his three works on the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles, reaching the conclusion in the last of them that the Acts was composed (or rather completed) in the year 63 A. D., and that the Gospel of Luke must accordingly be earlier than that. Harnack's reason for this date was the abrupt ending of the Book of Acts—an ending which unexpectedly stops at the end of St. Paul's two years of residence in Rome without telling us what happened to the Apostle afterward. This abrupt ending had been ex-

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

plained in other ways. Some (Paul Schrader and others) had supposed that St. Luke (or whoever the author was) had tried to show throughout his work that the Roman government, when it had occasion to notice Christianity at all, had been favorable to it, whereas, had he gone on, it would have been necessary to relate that it executed his hero. This he was supposed to have avoided by terminating his book abruptly. Others (Credner, Spitta, and Ramsay) had believed that the author intended to write a third work in which he expected to bring the story of Christianity up to his own time, and, having in one work traced the life of Jesus to the Ascension, and in another, the spread of the gospel from Jerusalem to Rome, he was content to conclude the Book of Acts where he did. Harnack found both these theories inadequate, and argued that the only satisfactory explanation of the abrupt ending of the book is the view that the author was writing in the year 63 A. D., that he had told all that had happened to St. Paul up to the time of writing, and concluded his narrative because there was no more to tell. To justify this dating Harnack went through the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts to show that nothing is contained in either of them that really could not have been written in the year 63 A. D.

Harnack, for example, discarded the view that the prophecy in Luke 21:20, "When ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that her desolation is at hand," is a prophecy after the event. It should, perhaps, be explained that, in the twenty-first chapter of Luke, St. Luke has worked over and made presentable to the readers of his time the thirteenth chapter of St. Mark. As

ST. LUKE'S WRITINGS

noted in a former lecture, Mark 13:14, "When ye see the abomination of desolation standing where he ought not (let him that readeth understand), then let them that are in Judæa flee unto the mountains," is a part of a little apocalypse written in the name of Jesus, and composed about the year 40 A. D. while Caligula was attempting to set up his statue in the temple at Jerusalem. The phrase "abomination of desolation" was borrowed from Daniel 11:31 and 12:11, where it referred to the setting up in the temple the statue of Zeus by Antiochus IV. It was a phrase that would be readily understood by Jews who were steeped in their history, but would mean nothing to a Gentile. Luke, writing for Gentiles, naturally changed it. Most scholars have contended, and still contend, that St. Luke could not have adopted the phraseology for the verse that he did, had he not known of the siege of Jerusalem by Titus in 70 A. D. Harnack pointed out that Jerusalem had been besieged many times, and that it was no stretch of prophetic imagination to foresee that it would be besieged again. He held that Luke's vague language is evidence that Jerusalem had not been destroyed. Harnack's point may, I think, be put differently. If St. Luke were writing his Gospel in the year 61 A. D., he would be compelled to interpret the phrase "abomination of desolation," not only for the reason already stated, but because it no longer seemed to correspond with fact. Claudius, on his accession in 41 A. D., had granted the Jews freedom from such interference, and Nero had respected it. For twenty years there had been no such danger. On the other hand, from the procuratorship of Cumanus, which began about 50 A. D., disorder had been

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

increasing in Judæa, and friction with the Government of Rome was often acute. It was quite possible (indeed would it not be natural?) for St. Luke to foresee that that friction was likely to lead to a war that would end in desecration of the temple, and to suppose that the enigmatical phrase ascribed to Jesus in Mark 13:14 referred to such a siege? Although, when Harnack's book first appeared, I regarded his argument as an excellent example of special pleading, I have come heartily to agree with him.

Another passage, which Professor Edgar J. Goodspeed⁹ claims with touching eloquence and ingenious argument to be evidence that Acts was not written until after St. Paul's death, is the statement in St. Paul's farewell to the Ephesians (Acts 20:25, 38), that they should never see his face again. Had not St. Paul been dead, says Goodspeed, why this pathos? Another explanation, quite simple and natural, is that these Ephesians sincerely loved this Christian hero, who in their midst had passed through such great suffering to give them the Gospel, and that St. Luke, as the Apostle was facing possible death, recalled St. Paul's words with a pang. He too loved St. Paul and the Apostle's words had to him an ominous sound. He had crossed seas and faced death to be near him. Goodspeed's reasoning is not convincing. Harnack was, I believe, right in his contention that this passage is strong evidence that Acts was written before St. Paul regained his freedom.

Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake would tentatively date the writing of the Acts between 95 and 100 A. D., because they think it probable that St. Luke employed the

⁹ *New Solutions of New Testament Problems*, Chicago, 1927, p. 96 ff.

ST. LUKE'S WRITINGS

writings of Josephus, whose *Antiquities of the Jews* was not published until the year 93 A. D., and Burton Scott Easton is reported to have argued in a public lecture that Acts was composed in 94 A. D. as a kind of apologia to the emperor in the persecution of Domitian. Easton too, apparently, reaches his date because he believes St. Luke was dependent on the *Antiquities* of Josephus. Possible contacts with Josephus have been considered since J. B. Ott¹⁰ called attention to the matter in 1741. In the nineteenth century Keim¹¹ and Krenkel¹² accepted the view that the dependence of St. Luke on the Jewish writer was made out. Cadbury¹³ has examined the evidence and, with his usual caution, pronounced it inconclusive, while C. C. Torrey¹⁴ has, to my mind, shown that Josephus and St. Luke had access to the same sources of information, which in at least one detail St. Luke or his source reported more faithfully than Josephus, though, perhaps, blundering badly as to a date.

The three passages in question are as follows: In Luke 3:1 Lysanias is said to have been tetrarch of Abilene in the fifteenth year of the emperor Tiberius, i. e., in 28 A. D., whereas the only Lysanias who ruled Abilene, as known from other ancient writers, was executed by Mark Antony in 36 B. C. It is generally supposed that St. Luke here made a chronological mistake. Now Josephus, *Antiquities*, XX, vii, 1, says that Claudius in the twelfth year of his

¹⁰ *Spicilegium sivi excerpta ex Flavio Josepho ad Novi Testamenti illustrationem*, 1741.

¹¹ *Aus dem Urchristentum*, 1878, pp. 1-27.

¹² *Josephus und Lucas*, 1884.

¹³ *Beginnings of Christianity*, II. p. 357.

¹⁴ *The Composition and Date of Acts*, 1916, pp. 70-72.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

reign (52 A. D.) gave various territories to Agrippa II, naming as one of them, "Abila which had been the territory of Lysanias." Krenkel and others have urged that St. Luke knew Josephus and was misled by him. I submit that the evidence does not prove that St. Luke ever saw Josephus, or that there may not have been a second Lysanias, as St. Luke implies.

Again in Acts 5:36 Gamaliel is represented as saying, "Before these days rose up Theudas . . . to whom a number of men, about four hundred, joined themselves." Josephus, *Antiquities*, XX, v, 1, tells how in the procuratorship of Fadus, 44-48 A. D., Theudas raised an insurrection, and then goes on to tell how James and Simon, sons of Judas of Galilee, who had raised a rebellion in the time of Quirinius, were crucified by Alexander, the successor of Fadus. St. Luke is credited with mixing up this very clear statement, and putting the historical mistake about Theudas into the mouth of Gamaliel. It is hard to believe St. Luke so stupid. That he did not draw his information from Josephus is shown by the fact that St. Luke says that Theudas had but about four hundred followers, whereas Josephus says he drew after him τὸν πλείστον ὄχλον, "the greatest multitude." St. Luke, or his source, must have employed a source of information not so clearly stated as the section in Josephus, and which did not so exaggerate.

Again, in Acts 21:38 the Chiliarch is said to have asked St. Paul, "Art not thou the Egyptian who before these days revolted and led out into the wilderness four thousand men of the Sicarii?" Josephus, *Wars*, II, xiii, 3, describes the Sicarii, then the false prophets who led them into

ST. LUKE'S WRITINGS

the desert and were destroyed by Felix, then he tells of an Egyptian who led thirty thousand men out of (not into) the desert. St. Luke is supposed by these modern critics to have blunderingly employed this long passage. That he never saw Josephus is to my mind amply proved by the fact that his four thousand men differs so widely from Josephus's thirty thousand. St. Luke clearly had some other source.

Time and space forbid consideration of less outstanding instances. There is nothing either in the Third Gospel or the Acts that compels us to postulate a date later than the year 63 for their composition, and I have gradually, as through the years I have studied these documents again and again, come to believe that the date set by Harnack, which I long thought impossible, is the real date of the completion of these books. The argument can, I now believe, be confirmed by what is called form-criticism. As stated in a former lecture the Apostolic Age falls into three periods. The first period is the time from 30 to 43 A. D. (or thereabouts), when the Church was unconscious of its mission, and that mission was being shaped by the zeal and the opportunities of obscure men, to the astonishment of the Apostles themselves. The second period, from about 43 A. D. to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A. D., was the period of conscious and purposeful efforts to evangelize the world. As we have seen, it was marked by serious friction in the Church itself. This period closed with the destruction of Jerusalem. The Jerusalem Church moved to Pella, and kept up its Jewish ways, but ceased to be influential. The Gentile Church, now separated from the Synagogue, swept on in the development of its thought

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

and practice, so that in the second century the Church at Pella was identified with Ebionites, Nazarenes, and groups that were considered heretical. The third period, from 70 A. D. to the close of the New Testament Canon, about 150 A. D., is the period when Christianity was institutionalized. The Apostles had passed away, and men fell back more and more upon the Church as an institution, and upon its traditions, officers, and authority as bulwarks against error. This period and the writings that it added to our New Testament will form the subject of our next lecture.

It is pertinent, however, to note here that the Lukan writings reflect the atmosphere of the Pauline, Gentile mission, and not at all the atmosphere of the institutionalizing period after the year 70 A. D. If form-criticism is of value, its lesson on this point should be heeded. Through the Gospel of Luke there sounds the note of universality. The Gospel is meant for all, quite in the Pauline vein. God seeks everyone, as the lost coin, the lost sheep, and the lost son were sought, but there is no note of churchliness as in the Gospel of Matthew, or in Ephesians, or in the Pastoral Epistles, or in the Gospel of John. In this respect the Book of Acts agrees with the genuine Pauline Epistles. Neither the Church nor its officers figure more prominently than in the period of evangelization. It is a necessary organization, its members have obligations to one another, but that is all. If its elders (presbyters) are called "bishops" (overseers) in Acts 20:28, so they are in St. Paul's Epistle to the Philipians (ch. 1:1), and indeed so they are in Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, ch. 44. Had the author of these

ST. LUKE'S WRITINGS

books been writing in the ecclesiasticalizing period, could he have escaped reflecting that period? The authors of St. Matthew and St. John did not. I quite agree that probably Acts was composed to be employed in St. Paul's defense, not before Domitian, but before Nero, had the case come to trial. Those who find a tendency strain in it are to a degree right, but the purpose of the writing was to influence Nero, not Domitian. When it was completed and the two years allowed for St. Paul's prosecutors to present their evidence had passed and the case was dismissed, St. Luke added his closing sentences, Acts 28:30, 31, and gave the book to the world.

We may, then, picture to ourselves St. Luke's literary activities during the years 58 to 63 A. D. as follows: He had, as a member of the Pauline mission, become acquainted with the document Q. At Corinth or Ephesus he had also become acquainted with Apollos' account of our Lord's nativity, the literary quality and miraculous element in which strongly appealed to him. During his two years at Caesarea he had learned from Philip and his daughters and from other Palestinian Christians many traditions about Jesus, also many more sayings and parables of the Master. These he combined with the material of Q thus making the document which Streeter has called L. In gathering this he also collected, probably some in oral and some in written form, tales of the early days of the Church in Jerusalem. Then he went with St. Paul to Rome, where he came into possession of a copy of the first edition of St. Mark's Gospel (the second edition had not yet been published). That Gospel, as noted in a former lecture, was probably composed for use in the mis-

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

sion of Barnabas. St. Luke, in the early months of his Roman residence, combined the new material in St. Mark with his document L and the nativity narrative of Apollos, and thus formed his Gospel as we have it. It then occurred to him to combine his own knowledge of the Pauline mission with the material he had gathered relating to the early days of Christianity into a story that would continue the narrative begun by the Gospel and at the same time be useful in St. Paul's defense, if his case ever came to trial. Thus, during his residence at Rome, between the years 61 and 63 A. D., he completed his Gospel and composed the Book of Acts. When the two years were completed and St. Paul's case was dismissed, he added two verses, which informed his contemporaries what had happened, though they have long been obscure to us. Thus we seem to be able to trace the activities of St. Luke as well as of St. Paul during these five eventful years.

In conclusion, let me again warn you that this interpretation of the facts is only a hypothesis. It is to me, however, a hypothesis which best interprets and gives coherence to such facts as we know.

VII

There is a tradition that the Gospel of Mark was written at Rome for Romans—a tradition which the late Professor B. W. Bacon believed that he had vindicated as historical in his book, *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?* If this be so, the tradition could apply only to the second edition of the book, i. e., the Gospel in its present form.

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

If, as Papias declared, Mark was the interpreter of St. Peter, he must have joined St. Peter after the conclusion of the mission of Barnabas, or after the death of Barnabas. It would appear from Philemon 24 that Mark was in Rome during St. Paul's imprisonment there. Presumably he was acting as St. Peter's helper then. If so, we may suppose that, remaining after the two great Apostles Peter and Paul had been put to death, he enlarged his Gospel by the insertion of the material between ch. 6:46 and 8:26, and the addition of a few scattered verses in other chapters, and gave it to the world a second time.

The Epistle to the Hebrews (so called) is in reality an address to Jewish Christians. As it is first quoted by Clement of Rome in his letter to the Corinthians, written about 96 A. D., it seems probable that it was addressed to Jewish Christians at Rome. We do not know who wrote it, but its most probable author was Apollos, for it is saturated with Alexandrine allegory, and is evidently the product of an eloquent master of Old Testament learning. That Hebrews was written while the temple was still standing is shown by ch. 9:6, 7, where it is said that the temple sacrifices at Jerusalem are still going on. Ch. 13:24 shows that it was written from some city where there was a Roman-Jewish colony; it may have been Corinth, Ephesus, or even Alexandria.

The author of this Epistle to the Hebrews introduced into Christian thought a new interpretation of the death of Jesus. St. Paul, reasoning as a Palestinian rabbi, had taught that the death and resurrection of Jesus abolished the law for Jesus' disciples and opened apart from the law a mercy seat, to which all the world might come. This

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

author, steeped in Philonic thought and allegory, regarded the law as a divinely given type, Jesus as the great High Priest, who with the offering of himself as a sacrifice and by his entry into heaven, the true holy of holies, had brought to light the reality which the type prefigured. As this gave to Christianity as to other faiths a sacrificial system, and as all converts to Christianity had been educated in faiths which possessed such systems, it proved a far more appealing interpretation than that of St. Paul. As the centuries passed it came to be accepted as the orthodox doctrine, so that through it Apollos, if, as we suppose, he was the author of Hebrews, exerted an influence on the future of Christian thinking almost as great as that of St. Paul or the author of the Fourth Gospel.

V

THE INSTITUTIONALIZING OF CHRISTIANITY

I

IN the last lecture we noted that St. Peter and St. Paul were both martyred under Nero, probably in the year 64 A. D., and something was also said of the profound influence of the destruction of Jerusalem upon the fortunes of Christianity. The destruction of Jerusalem marked an epoch in the history of the early Church. Christianity had started as a Jewish sect and, as the Book of Acts shows, it could as such claim freedom as a legal religion during the whole period covered by that book. When it came in contact with Roman officials, they recognized it as a part of Judaism. Nero's persecution of Christians proceeded from a special personal impulse, and in no way invalidated the legal standing of Christianity as a part of Judaism. When Jerusalem fell the Church and the synagogue were separated. The Church fled to Pella; the synagogue to Jabne, then called Jamnia, in the region south of Joppa. The Church at Pella possessed no Apostolic leaders. James and John had perished eight years before Jerusalem fell. It now exerted no more influence than any other church. In the great centers, such as Antioch, Ephesus, and Rome,

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

the Church had long been a schismatic synagogue, to which orthodox Jews were hostile. Had not the hostility of Ephesian Jews cost St. Paul his freedom through five long years? There were now no common pilgrimages from such cities of both orthodox Jews and Jewish Christians for united worship in the temple at Jerusalem. Jewish communities continued to be actually hostile, and therefore the separation between Synagogue and Church was complete. This separation left the Church free for developments in other directions. The friction between what in an earlier lecture I called the Jewish high churchmen and the liberals rapidly faded away. That friction had dogged the steps of St. Paul during his whole ministry, but, though some of the sentiments cherished by it came into the Gospel of Matthew through one of its sources, as an influence in the development of Christianity it was impotent.

One of the consequences of the separation of Synagogue and Church was that now Christianity was no longer a *religio licita* and thus became an object of persecution on the part of the Roman government. As Christians, no more than Jews, could participate in the worship of the emperor or his genius, their refusal brought them naturally into public notice, and from time to time they were compelled to bear the weight of the strong arm of the law. Professor Ramsay has shown that this was not crystallized into a settled policy on the part of the emperors until about the year 81 A. D. That was, however, only eleven years after Jerusalem was destroyed, and, since the tempo of ancient life was slower than ours, we could

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND SYNAGOGUE

hardly expect it to occur sooner. That Christians had now to face a hostile government, had a profound influence upon them.

II

Another fact, of even more fundamental importance, was that now the Church had no authoritative and inspired leaders in the sense that it had had before. With the martyrdom of Peter and Paul in the year 64 A. D., the last of the Apostles had been swept away. If Thomas, or James son of Alphaeus, or Simon the Cananæan, or any others of the Twelve were alive, they were in distant fields and, so far as the churches about the Mediterranean were concerned, their voices were silent. No Apostolic voice remained to give instruction that would be accepted as authoritative. The Church thus left without a captain was nevertheless confronted by problems that were increasingly acute. That syncretistic thought which had brought gnosticism to Colossæ still manifested itself in many centers in hydra-headed forms. Its seductions were insidious, and few were equipped to meet them on an intellectual basis. Friction, and even schisms, in congregations on other matters continued to arise as they had in Apostolic days. These had to be met and healed. Under these circumstances Christians everywhere during this period fell back more and more on the idea of the Church as an institution with authority, as the body of Christ, as the ground and bulwark of the truth. As difficulties still further increased, and the presiding presbyter was gradually elevated to the monarchic episcopate, the bishop

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

became the symbol or personification of the Church, and to be in unity with him was to be within the Church; to be in disunity, was to be without the Church.

The roots of this development, which reached its culmination only forty or more years after the destruction of Jerusalem, and then only in certain centers, go far back into Judaism. In the priestly strata of the Pentateuch Israel is regarded as a "congregation" or an "assembly" (the Hebrew word is sometimes *'edhah*, from *'udh*, "to return," or "repeat," and then to "revert," and sometimes *qāhāl*, from *qāhāl*, "to call"). In the thought of the compilers of the Code of Holiness and the Priestly Code, Israel was a community holy to Yahweh, and one that could be assembled. The legislator's thought envisaged a comparatively small community, such as the Babylonian captives or the post-exilic community in Jerusalem and its environs. By the time of Christ the development of the Synagogue and of sects, and widely scattered communities, made divergent through residence in different cultures, had to a degree blurred the sense of one great Jewish congregation. It had not destroyed by any means the sense of Jewish solidarity, but the word *'edhah*, which alone had come over into the Aramaic now employed as the vernacular, was applied to the synagogue—sometimes to the building and sometimes to the congregation. When Jesus said to St. Peter, "On this rock I will build my *'edhah*," it meant to a Jew my "synagogue." The Targums and Talmud employ *k'nîshtha* instead of *'edhah*. If Jesus also used *k'nîshtha*, not *'edhah*, the argument would be the same. Just as there were synagogues of Cyrenians, of Cilicians, and of Italian freedmen, so here was the be-

THE CHURCH

ginning of a synagogue of the followers of Jesus. They were part of the great community of Israel, who worshipped the one God; they only differed from the others in that they acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah. In the teaching of Jesus we can trace the idea of the Church no further than this. It was St. Paul who first carried it further. In trying to combat, in his letters to the Corinthians, the spirit of division that had grown up in that Church, he employed the figure of a body to bring home to them the fact that they bore an organic relation to one another, and that they could afford neither to despise nor to separate from one another. He tells them that in the body the eye and the hand need each other, the head cannot say to the feet "I have no need of you." In the same way Christians need one another. His mystic doctrine of the unity of each believer with Christ led St. Paul to go a step further, and declare that the group of believers are the body of Christ (1 Cor. 10:17). In his genuine epistles St. Paul did not develop the thought further, but he had invested the thought of the Church with a mystic significance, upon which in the stress of later struggles Christian thinkers eagerly laid hold. Thus it came about that during the period which we are now considering Christianity was institutionalized.

III

Still a third factor, though a more subtle and less obvious one, was the spread of the mystery religions and the competition which they offered to Christianity. The cult of Cybele, first brought to the vicinity of Rome in 204

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

B. C., had, because of its orgiastic character, been long hedged about by laws which prevented its spread among the people, but Claudius (41-54 A. D.) finally bestowed the imperial favor upon it. The cult of the Egyptian Isis, which for eighty years had been persecuted in Rome, had received the sanction of Caligula, who in 38 A. D. erected a temple for her. The cult of the Persian Mithra, which had long flourished in Rome's Asiatic provinces, spread in the reign of Vespasian (70-79 A. D.) into the western part of the empire, and for two and a half centuries thereafter was very popular. These cults offered, as did Christianity, personal salvation and immortality to people of all nations through union with a deity. They offered this by means of mystery-initiations and sacraments, and, although their heathen practices were repugnant to the very spirit of Christianity, it was inevitable that competition with them, and the reception into the Church of converts from them, should ultimately exert a materializing influence upon the way the Christian sacraments were regarded.

IV

With these influences in mind, we turn to an examination of the literature produced during this period, beginning with the Epistle to the Ephesians. It will doubtless surprise some of you to be told that this Epistle is not by St. Paul, but I have reluctantly come to believe that it is not. It is true that most of the specific arguments against St. Paul's authorship of it can be answered, but, as I have read it year after year with all the facts in mind, I have become convinced that it belongs to a later

EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

period than the life of the great Apostle. One persuasive fact is that the idea of the Church in Ephesians is much more developed than in St. Paul's epistles; (see Eph. 4:4-16). There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism; the Church is a body, of which Christ is the head. St. Paul had spoken of the Church as the body of Christ (1 Cor. 10: 16, 17), but his treatment of this figure in 1 Cor. 12: 12-31, and especially in vs. 21, seems to indicate that he did not apply the figure so literally as it is applied in Eph. 4:15, where Christ is declared to be the head of this body. Further, in Eph. 2:20 the Church is said to be a building, erected "on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone." This is a statement natural to a Christian who looked back to the pioneering days of Christianity, and revered as heroes the apostolic missionaries and the impassioned preachers by whom they were followed and reverently realized that the self-denying labors of these men had laid the foundation of the Church. Such a man might employ the language of Ephesians, but not St. Paul. Hear him saying to the Corinthians, "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (1 Cor. 3:11). He could speak of himself as a laborer on God's farm, and as a workman on God's building, but to call himself a part of the foundation of that building and to think of Christ as only as one stone in its foundation, was, I believe, for him impossible. Further, of the 155 verses in the Epistle to the Ephesians, seventy-eight, or exactly half, contain expressions or thoughts or both, identical with or borrowed from Colossians. Not only so, but every chapter is honeycombed with expres-

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

sions identical with those in other epistles of St. Paul.¹ The letter was evidently written, therefore, by one who had saturated himself in the Pauline epistles and was especially attracted by the Epistle to the Colossians. Professor Goodspeed believes that its author was the Christian who gathered the epistles of St. Paul into a collection.² His theory is that this man, on reading the Book of Acts, conceived the idea of gathering the letters of its hero into a body, and, having done so and copied them, he composed Ephesians as an introduction to them. Be this as it may, the author of Ephesians, though he lived later than St. Paul, was one of the choicest of spirits. The heights of aspiration and the beauty of expression exhibited in the prayer in Eph. 3:14-21, beginning, "for this cause I bow my knees" are not surpassed in the whole New Testament. Nevertheless it seems clear that he wrote after the Apostles were dead, at a time when the Church as an organization was assuming greater importance in Christian consciousness—an importance which this author's composition helped to increase.

V

Another Epistle of this period, called forth by the persecutions which Christians were suffering, was the First Epistle of St. Peter. It is addressed to Christians

¹ See E. J. Goodspeed, *The Meaning of Ephesians*, Chicago, 1933, pp. 83-163, where the material from the various epistles is arranged in parallel columns.

² See E. J. Goodspeed, *New Solutions of New Testament Problems*, Chicago, 1927, chapters I and II.

FIRST PETER

in the provinces of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, named in that order. It was written to encourage Christians who were being systematically persecuted just because they were Christians, as ch. 4:13-15 shows. Christians were classed with murderers, thieves, and evildoers. As Ramsay perceived more than forty years ago, this was not possible before the year 81 A. D., and the situation presupposed may not have occurred until some years later. Ramsay also realized that St. Peter could not have written the letter if he were martyred in the reign of Nero. That St. Peter was not the author would seem to be made clear by ch. 5:1: "The presbyters, therefore, among you I exhort, who am a fellow-presbyter, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ"—a passage which, on the supposition of Petrine authorship, contains two discrepancies. St. Peter was an apostle, not a presbyter. The functions of the two were as distinct during the first century as those of a missionary bishop and a vestryman are today. Further, St. Peter was not a witness of the sufferings of Christ; he was one of those of whom it was said, "They all forsook him and fled." In the speeches attributed to St. Peter in the Acts, he six times calls himself a witness of the Resurrection, which was true, but never a witness of his sufferings. Streeter, following a suggestion of Harnack, is of the opinion that originally that portion of the document between ch. 1:3 and 4:11 was the sermon of a bishop or presiding presbyter to a group of newly baptized persons, while ch. 4:12-5:11 is a pastoral letter, written perhaps two or three years later by the author of the sermon. Still later, ch. 1:1, 2 and ch. 5:12-14 were added by an editor

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

who combined them, to give wider currency to documents already highly valued for their intrinsic worth. This theory is frankly conjectural, but it would account for the facts. Whether true or not, the Epistle was written by someone who knew St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and who also knew and drew largely upon the Epistle to the Ephesians.³ Its date is accordingly doubtless later than the gathering of the Pauline Epistles into a collection. It probably belongs to the period between 81 and 96 A. D. Its author not only knew the Pauline Epistles but was profoundly influenced by St. Paul's thought. His conception of the way the Cross of Christ affected the forgiveness of sins, as expressed in 1 Pet. 2:24, is, when analyzed, identical with that of St. Paul which we traced in a former lecture. If the statement in ch. 5:12 that the document was written by Silvanus represents a historical fact, it would be easy to explain this reflection of Pauline thought, since Silvanus was for a time a companion of St. Paul, but it is difficult, from what is said of Silvanus in the Book of Acts, to think of him as the presbyter of a local church. We have to remember that the presbyterate was at this period an office of considerably less dignity than that of evangelist or prophet. However obscure the problems connected with the origin of the Epistle may be, it is, nevertheless, one of the noble Christian documents of the New Testament, and affords us some of the most precious glimpses into the struggles and aspirations of Christians of the last quarter of the first century.

³ For proof see Moffatt, *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, pp. 382 f.

GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

VI

Another work, the composition of which fell in this period, is the Gospel according to Matthew—a gospel which reflects the growing emphasis which, as years passed, was being placed upon the Church and upon Apostolic authority, and which also records Christ's words to St. Peter, which were later to play such a part in the claims of the church at Rome. While all this is true, its author was a Jew, who was deeply interested in the fulfilment of prophecy and added many editorial notes, calling attention to such fulfilments to earlier traditions. He also exhibits the somewhat somber Hebraic outlook on life in contrast to the more joyous Hellenistic outlook of St. Luke. Where the compiler of this Gospel lived, we cannot be certain. A number of scholars have in recent years guessed that he lived in or near Antioch in northern Syria, and on the whole this seems probable.

Although the author of this Gospel was a Jew, he had caught the spirit of the universal sweep of the Gospel. He portrays the risen Christ as commanding his followers to "make disciples of all the nations." Further, he alone of all the writers in the New Testament employs the Trinitarian baptismal formula, "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 28:19). When the Book of Acts was written, Christians baptized simply "In the name of the Lord Jesus." This formula, as well as the ecclesiastical outlook of the book, is a mark of its comparatively late date.

The author of the Gospel of Matthew followed, in

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

composing his work, the method that St. Luke had employed in composing his Gospel; he used previously existing documentary sources. One of these was St. Mark's Gospel which he possessed in its final form. In other words, he used the last edition of it, thus admitting into his Gospel the materials in St. Mark that Luke did not have. He also had before him and employed the document Q which he possessed in its original form. Neither the expansions of this document, which it is supposed that St. Luke made at Caesarea, nor the Gospel of Luke itself were known to him. He did possess, however, a document containing material which was accessible to neither St. Mark nor St. Luke—a document which the researches of recent years is gradually disclosing—and which scholars represent by the symbol M, because it was employed only by Matthew.⁴ This source had clearly been compiled by some Christian of the Jewish party during the controversy over the Gentile mission, between the years 43 and 64 A. D. Perhaps the tradition was that the collection of sayings in M was made by the Apostle Matthew. If so, it was the employment of this document which led to the naming of the resultant compilation "The Gospel according to Matthew." Be that as it may, it was from this document M that some of the most valued of our Lord's teaching in that compilation which we call "The Sermon on the Mount" was taken. Besides these three sources the compiler of Matthew employed a source which gave an account of our Lord's birth and infancy.

⁴ Cf. E. D. Burton, *Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, V, Chicago, 1904, p. 233 ff.; H. B. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, N. Y., 1925, ch. IX; and R. H. Rosché, *Matthew's Special Source* (not yet published).

GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

Most scholars have believed that this source differed from the one employed by St. Luke, the composition of which we have attributed to Apollos. So far as the first chapter of Matthew is concerned, I could easily believe that it was the author's modification of the source attributed to Apollos, the modifications having been made by the compiler for reasons which we can, I believe, readily discern. The material, however, contained in ch. 2 is without parallel elsewhere in the New Testament, and must have been derived from a special source, oral or written.

This author's method of treating his sources was just the opposite of that employed by St. Luke. St. Luke fitted his materials together in blocks, so as to break up the continuity of a source as little as was compatible with combination. The author of St. Matthew treated his materials topically, culling from his sources and combining ethical teachings of Jesus, thus composing what we call "The Sermon on the Mount," again gathering into one collection stories of miracles, as in Matt. chs. 8, 9, and still again making collections of parables as in ch. 13. It thus happens that his sources were completely torn asunder. Since we still possess one of them, the Gospel of Mark, in its original form, it is easy to discern his method.

Perhaps the author of the Gospel of Matthew had been a catechist, whose duty it had been for years to instruct recently baptized persons in the precepts of the Gospel and who had arranged it by subjects. Being a devout Jew he grouped the laws of the New Covenant into five collections, just as the laws of the Pentateuch and the psalms of the Psalter had each been collected into five books. In the Gospel of Matthew each of these

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

five collections is marked by a statement of what happened when Jesus had finished the teaching contained in the section just preceding. Thus in Mt. 7:28, 29, which concludes the section beginning with the Baptism of John, we read: "When Jesus ended these words, the multitudes were astonished." The section (ch. 8:1-11:1) begins by telling what Jesus did when he came down from the mountain, and ends by saying, "When Jesus made an end of commanding his twelve disciples, he departed thence to teach and to preach in their cities." The third section (chs. 11:2-13:53), concludes with the statement, "When Jesus had finished these parables, he departed thence, and came into his own country." The fourth section, (Mt. 15:54-19:1) concludes thus, "When Jesus had finished these words, he departed from Galilee and came into the borders of Judæa beyond Jordan." The last section (chs. 19:2-26:1) ends with the words, "When Jesus had finished all these words he said to his disciples . . ." The author of the Gospel seems not to have known St. Luke's Gospel, which had, in my opinion, been composed some twenty years before. If he had been a catechist, when he came to the decision to put his teachings into the form of a Gospel, all he had to do was to prefix a prologue, telling how Jesus came into the world and of his relations with John the Baptist, and, as an epilogue, St. Mark's Passion Narrative, which told of the end of Jesus' earthly life. I believe that somehow so we rightly envision the genesis of the Gospel according to St. Matthew.

The source M, which the author employed, contained some strong sayings as to the validity of the Jewish law. "Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle

GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished." "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil." (See Mt. 5:17, 18.) Such sayings were congenial to the heart of the compiler of the Gospel. The events of the life of Christ were fulfilments of Old Testament prophecies, and though Jesus, as this evangelist records, said again and again, "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, . . . but I say unto you," this author regarded the new requirements of Jesus, not as an annulment, but as a fulfilling of the old. Doubtless it was his delight in tracing fulfilments of prophecy that helped to make the Gospel of Matthew the most popular of the four in the Church at large during centuries that followed. Such conceptions were especially congenial to the point of view of the world of that time—non-Christians as well as Christians.

Although some of the early collections of sayings of Jesus had been made in Aramaic, all our Gospels, including that of St. Matthew, were written in Greek. One mark of the late date of the Gospel is that the Aramaic word '*edhah* or *k'nîshtha*, is twice represented in the Gospel by the Greek *ēkklēsia*, the regular Christian word for "church," and not by the earlier Jewish-Greek *synagōgē*. Further, the Church is represented in ch. 18:17 as having authority. One who fails to listen to that authority may be regarded as a Gentile or a publican. In this same context in words which are represented as addressed to Jesus' disciples, they are told, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." "Binding" and "loosing" were Jewish phrases for giving authoritative interpreta-

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

tions of the Law of God. Their use here implies a recognition of the ability of the Apostles to speak as the representatives of God's authority. In ch. 16:19 this Gospel represents these same words as addressed to St. Peter, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," etc. This may be said to represent the primacy of St. Peter, but not the primacy as Rome has interpreted it. The saying in its earliest form in Aramaic was probably written before the Gospel had reached Rome at all, and represented the feeling of a Jewish Christian, as he recalled the saying that Christ had founded his Church as a Jewish synagogue (i. e., as a branch of Judaism), and that St. Peter, not St. Paul, was its ideal exponent and representative. In its wording it simply states that St. Peter was the first to recognize the Messiahship of Jesus, which they all immediately accepted, and so was the first to gain the spiritual authority which they all came almost at once to share. The author of the Gospel had no thought of such claims as the papacy has erected on his foundation, but he does write with a Church consciousness, and with a realization that the Apostles, because of their nearness to Jesus and because he had especially instructed them, were qualified to exercise unique authority in the Church.

VII

Somewhere about the year 90 A. D., at any rate before the end of the reign of Domitian, our New Testament Book of Revelation came into its present form. The denunciation of certain phases of gnosticism in its first three

BOOK OF REVELATION

chapters, and its testimony to the inroads the forms of that heresy were making in the churches of Asia, are evidence that these chapters were shaped in part by the combat with this influential element of the thought of this period. The whole tone of the book indicates that it was produced in a time of persecution. The messages to the seven churches of Asia bear witness that its author lived in that province, probably at Ephesus. Opinions as to the structure and interpretation of this book are almost as numerous as its interpreters have been. Someone has said that its study "either finds a man mad or leaves him so." Scholars are now pretty well agreed that it contains materials earlier than the date of its final composition, which were reworked and reminted by its author, but when they come to specifying what these materials are, they are as far from agreement as most madmen. Personally, though perhaps mad, I am persuaded that the great bulk of the book, apart from chapters 1-3 and portions of chs. 19-22, was composed before the year 70 A. D., and that the earliest portion of it originated in the year 40 A. D. The latter date is indicated by Rev. 11:7, 8, 14, and the former, by Rev. 17:9, 10. I am further convinced that about half of the material was originally of Jewish composition.⁵ Be this as it may, the Book of Revelation, apart from chapters 1-3, is an expression of a mighty influence that survived from the first decades of Christianity. In the first lecture it was pointed out how apoc-

⁵ C. A. Briggs, *The Messiah of the Apostles*, New York, 1895, chs. IX-XVI, and G. A. Barton, "The Apocalypse and Recent Criticism" in the *American Journal of Theology*, II (1898), 776-80x.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

alyptic hopes filled the minds of the Apostles to the exclusion of all thought of a world mission for themselves, and in another lecture something was said of the fact that Jewish apocalyptic was the pioneer philosophy of history. An English scholar has recently shown how the apocalyptists, taking myth and ritual thought-patterns that had been potent in the east for millennia, but which had been largely pushed into the background in Judaism, because of a faith in God that creates "from its own wreck the thing it contemplates," took these patterns "in their 'last giddy hour of dread endurance'" and wove them into a system of philosophy of history that helped to sustain their faith, and girded them for heroic deeds and martyrdom. In that atmosphere Christianity had been born. The new faith had never sloughed it off. While St. Paul apparently outgrew it, he never discarded its vocabulary, and though the author of the Fourth Gospel discards it in his Gospel, in his First Epistle he still writes as though it were real. In the minds of the greatest Christian thinkers its inadequacy was becoming apparent, but it was a philosophy so simple, so expectant of miracle, and one which so appealed to the unregenerate desire for vengeance latent in the breast of even every Christian, that it died very slowly. The compilation in the Book of Revelation, which gathers up and reinterprets much of the most forceful and vivid apocalyptic of the first century from both Jewish and Christian sources, is the last and greatest expression of it in the New Testament. As *Chiliasm* it lived on sporadically in the early Church, and through the influence of the Bible survives in some Christian circles to the present day, but the Book of Revela-

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

tion was, for Christians,⁶ its last, its most brilliant, and its expiring flame of influence.

VIII

Somewhere between 90 and 115 A. D. there lived at Ephesus the Author of the Fourth Gospel, the greatest Christian genius of this period. In the shaping of the thought of the Christian world his influence is fully as great as that of St. Paul. What his name was, we do not know. That he was not John the son of Zebedee is now generally recognized by competent scholars. Indeed, if that John were martyred in the year 62 A. D., he could not have written this Gospel. That he was not the John who saw the visions of the Book of Revelation is also the judgment of present-day scholarship. The thought of the two books is mutually exclusive. I am inclined to agree with those scholars who attribute its composition to John the Presbyter, who was distinguished from John the Apostle by Papias, as Eusebius⁷ long ago perceived. The same author composed the three epistles which pass under the name of John.

For our present purpose the influence which molded the Gospel are of greater importance than the name of its author. Of course the great motive which prompted the composition of the Epistles and Gospel of John was the love of Jesus Christ and the desire to lead all men to reverence and worship him, but while this supreme

⁶ One Jewish apocalypse, *The Rest of the Words of Baruch*, dates from 132-135 A. D.

⁷ *Ecclesiastical History*, III, 39.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

motive shines throughout these documents, a number of minor special motives are apparent as one reads. These minor motives were due to special conditions of thought and practice among those who composed the environment of the writer.

One of the most palpable of these motives was opposition to gnosticism. This stands out clearly and undeniably in the First Epistle of St. John. The errorists denounced in that Epistle were the type of gnostic known as Docetists. They held that Christ, an emanation from the God of purity, was not really incarnate in the man Jesus, who was, like other human beings, corrupt flesh; he only *seemed* to be. Christ did not, therefore, really suffer on the Cross, he only *seemed* to suffer. This, in the Epistle, our author denounced as a denial that "Jesus Christ had come in the flesh." While in the Gospel his polemic is not so pointed, it is none the less real. "In the beginning was the Logos, or Word; the Logos was of the same substance as God, and the Logos became flesh and tabernacled among us." Note that he, after the manner of St. Paul, combats gnosticism by so interpreting the nature of Christ as to cut the ground from beneath gnosticism.

Another of the aims of this author was to show up the perversity of the Jews. By the time this Gospel was written the Church and the Synagogue had been long separated. We learn from Irenæus that at Ephesus a Jew named Cerinthus was an ardent leader of opposition against the Christians—an opposition that had been continuous from the days of St. Paul. It was Trophimus, an Ephesian Jew, who had caused St. Paul's arrest in

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Jerusalem (Acts 21:29). It thus came about that Pharisees and Sadducees, Herodians, and the rest are absent from the pages of St. John, and we hear only of Jews, and to these Jesus is reported to have said, "Ye are of your father, the devil" (John 8:44).

Still another purpose of the writer was to convince the devotees of the sect of John the Baptist, which had been in Ephesus since the days of St. Paul (Acts 19:3), and which the researches of recent years have shown to have persisted long afterward and finally to have been absorbed, in part at least, in Mandæanism, that John had himself recognized his mission as temporary, and that John had borne definite and effective witness to the Messiahship of Jesus.

Yet another aim of the author would seem to have been to combat the Stoic doctrine that the *Logos* was simply divine reason, and that man could accomplish his own salvation. Our author makes the *Logos* personal, and everlasting life is obtained by faith in Christ.

Further, as one studies the Gospel carefully he detects the influence, through rivalry and opposition, of the mystery religions that were so popular at that period. These mystery religions held out the hope of an immortal life through union with a god—a union achieved through the eating of the flesh of a sacred victim. In contradistinction to such teaching our author is at great pains, in both Gospel and Epistle, to insist that eternal life is God's gift, that it consists of knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ whom he sent, that he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life and that he that believeth not on

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

the Son shall not see life, and that the only sacred meal that gives life is the eating of the flesh of the Son and the drinking of his blood.

The influences thus far mentioned came from without Christianity; there were others that came from within. When our author wrote, the Apostles had all passed away, and the first waves of enthusiasm which had swept Christianity forward had subsided. In every religion such creative periods are followed by organization and institutionalism. We have previously noted how in this period Christians were falling back upon the Church and its authority. This our author perceived, and he approved of it. He takes pains in his Gospel to emphasize the idea although he never employs the word *ĕkklēsia*. He does tell us, though, that our Lord in his last great prayer prayed not only for his immediate disciples, but "for them also who believe on me through their word," thus looking forward to an unending succession of believers in the Church. This Church was to include Gentiles. "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold, them also I must bring, . . . and they shall become one flock" (John 10:16). This universal church is, however, to be quite distinct from the world. It is to be in the world ("I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world") but not of it ("they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world"). The author accordingly believed in a universalism with limitations. Some of all nations would be in the Church, but there would always be a "world" outside the Church. This was a limitation of the teachings of the Master. A church must have officers who have authority, and to this our author has no objection. He

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

tells us (John 20:23) that the risen Jesus said to the Apostles, "whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained."

While the Author of the Fourth Gospel believed in the Church, he did not believe in a static Church, or in a faith "once for all delivered to the saints." He held that the Master had promised the Spirit, which should lead into all the truth, and that the Spirit would teach his disciples the many things that Christ would have said to them, had they been able to bear them when he was in the flesh (John 16:12, 13). Revelation was to be progressive.

While all this is true (and the theme might be greatly elaborated) the author quietly endeavors to correct an undue emphasis upon the sacraments as having in themselves a magical potency. That idea was creeping into the Church of his time. It was this tendency that led his contemporary, Ignatius of Antioch, to speak of the Eucharist as "the medicine of immortality (Ad. Eph. 20:2). St. John did not approve of this, but his method of showing his disapproval is peculiarly his own. In his account of the Last Supper he omits the account of the institution of the rite altogether. Instead he tells us how Jesus washed the disciples' feet, as though he would say that the Master's parting legacy was not a ceremonial sacrament, but an example of lowly service. The author's treatment of the Eucharist is found in the sixth chapter of his Gospel in a discourse which he tells us Jesus delivered on the feeding of the five thousand. There, as we have already noted, he tells us that Jesus said, "Except ye eat

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood ye have not life in yourselves." He goes on, however, to say that Jesus said, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life." Not magic received through a material substance, but the possession of the Spirit of the living God, mediated through Christ, was the life-giving reality. Yet there is no hint that the partaking of the symbols of the flesh and blood should be discontinued. The author's effort seems rather to have been directed to the prevention of the loss of the spiritual reality through the degradation of the symbols in Christian thought to substances charged with magical potency as in the mystery religions. His attitude toward Baptism is not so clear, but it is he alone of all the evangelists who tells us that "Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples" (John 4:2).

Much effort has been made by scholars to determine from what sources the author derived the information contained in his Gospel. It has become clear that he knew and made considerable use of the Gospel of Mark, and that he knew but made less use of the Gospel of Luke. He was apparently unacquainted with the Gospel of Matthew. Scholars are not agreed as to whether we can or cannot detect in the Gospel a special Johannine source. Personally I am inclined to agree with Streeter, that it would be as easy to reconstruct a pig from a string of sausages as to reconstruct its sources from the Gospel of John.

Time forbids our following the topic further, but enough has been said to indicate the influences which led

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

the Gospel of John to take the form that it has. Christianity, in its syncretistic and polyglot environment, had reached a parting of the ways. It must receive a universal—a cosmic—interpretation or gradually die away. This inspired genius gave it the new and necessary interpretation. He so told the story of the Son of God as to meet the various currents of thought of his time and to commend Christ as the supreme revelation of the Father and the one hope of man to all sorts and conditions of men. The modern reader instinctively feels that, however freely historical facts may sometimes be dealt with, nevertheless the Fourth Gospel interprets the mind of Christ better than any of the other three.

IX

The Epistles to Timothy and Titus, commonly called the Pastoral Epistles, although attributed to St. Paul and in part based on some genuine notes written by the Apostle, have been conclusively shown to belong to the period we are considering.⁸ We cannot date their composition exactly, but their author lived in the same general period as the Author of the Fourth Gospel and Ignatius of Antioch. Like them he was confronted with the inroads of gnosticism, and like them he attempted to stem its oncoming tide. Unable to meet gnostic thought intellectually as the author of the Fourth Gospel did, like Ignatius he fell back upon authority. While the author of the Pastorals

⁸ See E. Y. Hincks, "The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles" in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XVI (1897), 94-117, and P. N. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, Oxford, 1921.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

has less passion than Ignatius, his system of thought is more complete and coherent. In asserting the reality of the facts of Christ's life against the docetic errors, Ignatius at times falls into a strain that reminds us of the Roman Baptismal Formula, which afterward grew into the Apostles' Creed. The author of the Pastorals was acquainted with a "form of sound words" which embodied the true faith. He speaks of "the faith" in an objective way as something that could be "kept" (see 1 Tim. 1:10; 2 Tim. 1:13; 4:3; Tit. 1:9, 13; 2:1, 2; 1 Tim. 1:9; 3:9; 5:8; 6:10; 2 Tim. 4:7). Further, the author of the Pastorals held this faith because it had been handed down from the Apostles; one believed it because one knew from whom one had received it; it was to be committed to faithful men and so passed on to the future (see 1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:13; 3:14). Here we have the first formulation of the doctrine of Apostolic Tradition of which such use was made later by Irenæus and Tertullian.

Like Ignatius the author believes in the threefold ministry of the Church: bishops, presbyters, and deacons. While he does not assert the rights of the monarchical episcopate with the passion of Ignatius, he assumes that the bishop is the head of the Church and that he may sit in judgment on presbyters (1 Tim. 5:19). He devotes considerable space to describing the qualifications of one who aspires to the office of bishop (1 Tim. 3:1-7). In the Pastorals, however, the bishop is only an officer of the Church. It is the Church which is the "pillar and bulwark" of the truth (1 Tim. 3:15). This Church is equipped not only with its threefold ministry, but has an order of official widows, enrolled as such (1 Tim. 5:9), who doubt-

JAMES, JUDE AND SECOND PETER

less ministered to the sick and needy as district nurses now do. In all this the author radiates an atmosphere very different from St. Paul's. If time permitted, it could be shown that his conception of good works was quite un-Pauline. Perhaps his most startling un-Pauline statement, in view of St. Paul's doctrine of salvation by faith, is the statement (1 Tim. 2:15) that, under certain conditions, women may be saved by childbearing!

Time forbids further citation, but enough has been said to show how the conditions of life and thought at the turn of the first century led one who lacked the intellectual power and mystical insight of the Author of the Fourth Gospel to fall back on the Church, tradition, and creed as his guide in the maze of life. The great majority of Christians, while they have admired and revered the author of the Fourth Gospel, have felt greater kinship with the author of the Pastorals.

X

Over the three remaining books of the New Testament we need not, for our present purpose, delay long. The so-called Epistle of James would not, but for the superscription, be thought of as an Epistle at all. It is really a moral address after the manner of the Greek diatribe.⁹ Its author was a Jewish Christian, who knew St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans and did not approve of its teaching. He did not, however, belong to any of the Jewish-Christian types of St. Paul's time. He has no word to say of the value of

⁹ See J. H. Ropes, *James in the International Critical Commentary*, pp. 10-15.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

the Jewish dietary laws, of circumcision, or of the value of the temple service. He wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem when, for Christians, those questions had been forever settled. To him Christianity is a new law—the perfect law of liberty. He had no use for a faith that was not manifested in works. The calmness with which he writes would lead one to think that the destruction of Jerusalem lay far behind him. His letter breathes the atmosphere of the period between 100 and 125 A. D. The author nowhere claims to be an Apostle, and clearly was not. His composition only slowly won its way to a place in the New Testament Canon, and then it succeeded only on the mistaken supposition that it was composed by James, the Lord's brother.

The Epistle of Jude was, like the Pastoral Epistles, called forth by the inroads of gnosticism. It was written later than the Pastoral Epistles, which its author quotes as of Apostolic authority (see Jude, 17, 18. Cf. 1 Tim. 5:1; 2 Tim. 3:1). Unlike the author of the Pastorals, he has no method either of creed or Church by which to oppose error. His one weapon is denunciation. The author calls himself simply Jude, the brother of James, and, as in the case of the Epistle of James, his letter slowly won its way to a place in the Canon because it came to be accepted as the work of our Lord's brother Jude, or Judas. We learn, however, from Eusebius,¹⁰ who got his information from Hegesippus, that in the reign of Domitian the only kindred of our Lord who could then be found were two grandsons of Jude, who were small farmers in Palestine. As Jude was represented on earth only by

¹⁰ *Ecclesiastical History*, III, 20.

JAMES, JUDE AND SECOND PETER

grandsons some thirty years before our Epistle of Jude was composed, it is clear that some other Judas must have been its author.

The Second Epistle of Peter, which is clearly a pseudonymous work, was, like the Epistle of Jude, called forth in part by gnosticism. The author's method of combating it is, like Jude's, simple denunciation. Indeed he knew Jude's letter, and copied its vigorous arraignment of gnostic errors into his own.¹¹ The author had, however, another motive for writing. The Apostles had been long dead and the second coming of Christ had not occurred. The unbelieving were making mockery of Christian hopes (2 Pet. 3:4). A part, therefore, of the author's purpose was to point out that God's conception of days and years is not like ours, and that his promises are sure, even though we misunderstand them. Second Peter, written perhaps about 150 A. D., at a time when St. Paul's Epistles had been canonized and were already placed on a par with the Old Testament Scriptures (2 Pet. 3:15, 16), is the latest book in the New Testament.

XI

Our task is completed. Our review of the influences reflected in the books of the New Testament that were composed after 70 A. D. abundantly proves the thesis that, after the Apostles had passed away and the Christians were confronted by the inroads of syncretistic thought and the competition of the mystery religions, they fell back

¹¹ For proof, use the parallel columns in Moffatt's *Introduction to the Lit. of the N. T.*, p. 348 f.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

more and more on the Church as an organization, on its traditions as a body of teaching, on its ministry, especially its bishops, as successors of the Apostles, and so institutionalized Christianity. Under the circumstances it was doubtless a necessary process. Few Christians were able to think clearly and successfully. This has been true, not only of Christians, but of the devotees of other religions in every age. The Author of the Fourth Gospel was a great exception, but to him the Church, its oneness, and its separateness from the world was one of Christ's most precious legacies. It is difficult to see how, unless Christianity had been institutionalized, it could have survived all these centuries. Modern psychology is now teaching us that we are social beings; we cannot even be persons alone, much less be saved alone. An institution may be so exalted as to crush morality, ethics, individualism, and personality, and this has sometimes happened in the Church. On the other hand, an institution that conserves the best aspiration and teaching that the past has achieved, fosters high aspiration, ethical endeavor, and personal consecration in the present, and helps to keep the mind open to the leading of the Spirit into new fields of thought, of service, and of sacrifice for the future is indispensable to the best life of man. So, in his providence, God evolved the Church.

CHRONOLOGY

	A. D.
The Day of Pentecost	end of May 30
Appointment of Deacons	July (?) 30
Martyrdom of St. Stephen	October (?) 30
Conversion of St. Paul	December (?) 30
St. Paul in Arabia	31 to 32
St. Paul returns to Jerusalem	32 or 33
Caligula tries to erect his statue in the Temple	39 to 40
St. Barnabas brings Saul to Antioch	43
Martyrdom of James son of Zebedee	44
Death of Herod Agrippa I	44
Composition of the document Q	40 to 47
Barnabas, Saul, and Titus carry alms to Jerusalem	46
First missionary journey	47
Composition of the Epistle to the Galatians	48
Apostolic Council at Jerusalem	49
Composition of the document M.	49 to 60
Second missionary journey	50 to 52
Composition of the first edition of St. Mark's Gospel	50 or 51
St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians	50 to 51
The conversion of Apollos	53
Third missionary journey	53 to 58
Composition of the account of the birth and infancy of Jesus	53 to 58
St. Paul's correspondence with the Corinthians	55 to 57
St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans	58
St. Paul's arrest in Jerusalem	58

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

St. Paul's imprisonment at Caesarea	58 to 60
Composition of the first draft of St. Luke	58 to 60
The voyage, shipwreck, and arrival at Rome	60 to 61
Imprisonment at Rome	61 to 63
Composition of second draft of St. Luke	61 to 62
Composition of the Epistles to Philemon, Colossians, and the Philippians	61 to 63
Martyrdom of James the Lord's brother and John son of Zebedee	62
Composition of the Acts of the Apostles	62 to 63
St. Paul's release	63
St. Peter and St. Paul martyred by Nero	64
Composition of the Epistle to the Hebrews	65 to 70
Second edition of St. Mark	68 to 70
Destruction of Jerusalem	70
Composition of First Peter	81 to 90
Composition of the Gospel of Matthew	85 to 90
Composition of the Epistle to the Ephesians	85 to 95
Compilation of the Book of Revelation	90 to 96
First Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians	96
The Gospel and Epistles of John	90 to 110
The Pastoral Epistles	cir. 110
Epistles of Ignatius	110 to 115
Epistle of James	100 to 125
Epistle of Jude	120 to 130
Second Epistle of Peter	cir. 150

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bacon, B. W., *The Beginnings of the Gospel Story*, New Haven, 1909.
- , *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*, New York, 1910.
- , *The Gospel of Mark*, New Haven, 1925.
- , *The Gospel of the Hellenists*, New York, 1933.
- , *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?* Cambridge, 1919.
- , *Studies in Matthew*, New York, 1930.
- Barton, G. A. *Archæology and the Bible*, 6th ed., Philadelphia, 1933.
- , *Christ and Evolution*, Philadelphia, 1934.
- , "Professor Torrey's Theory of the Aramaic Origin of the Gospels and the First Half of the Acts of the Apostles," in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. XXXVI, pp. 357-373.
- , "The Question of 'Ur-Marcus once more," in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XLVIII, (1929), 239-248.
- , "The Spiritual Development of Paul," in *The New World*, VIII (March, 1899), pp. 111-124.
- , *Studies in New Testament Christianity*, Philadelphia, 1928.
- Beckwith, I. T., *The Apocalypse of John*, New York, 1922.
- Briggs, C. A., *The Messiah of the Apostles*, New York, 1895, chs. IX-XVI.
- Bruce, A. B., *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, New York, 1899.
- Bultmann, R., *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 2te Auf., Göttingen, 1931.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

- Burton, E. D., *Galatians in the International Critical Commentary*, New York, 1920.
- , "Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem," in *The Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, Vol. V, Chicago, 1904, pp. 195-264.
- Cadbury, H. J., *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*, Cambridge, 1919-1920.
- , *The Making of Luke-Acts*, New York, 1927.
- Charles, R. H., *The Revelation of St. John*, 2 vols., in the *International Critical Commentary*, New York, 1920.
- Creed, J. M., *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, London, 1930.
- Dibelius, M., *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, 2te Auf., Tübingen, 1933.
- , *From Tradition to Gospel*, London, 1934.
- , "Gethsemane," in the *Crozer Seminary Quarterly*, XII (July, 1935), pp. 254-265 (translated by Enslin).
- Dobschütz, E. von, *The Apostolic Age*, London, 1909.
- Drummond, James, *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, New York, 1904.
- Easton, B. S., *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, New York, 1926.
- , *The Gospel before the Gospels*, New York, 1928.
- Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine*, Translated with Introduction and Notes by H. J. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton, London, 1927.
- Everett, C. C., *The Gospel of Paul*, Boston, 1893.
- Fascher, E., *Die Formgeschichtliche Methode*, 1924.
- Foakes-Jackson, F. A., and Lake, Kirsopp, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Vols. I-V, London, 1920-1933.
- Garvie, Alfred, *The Beloved Disciple*, New York, 1922.
- Goodspeed, E. J., *New Solutions of New Testament Problems*, Chicago, 1927.
- , *The Meaning of Ephesians*, Chicago, 1933.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Grant, F. C., *The Growth of the Gospels*, New York, 1933.
- , *Form Criticism*, Chicago, 1934.
- Harnack, A., *Luke the Physician*, New York, 1907.
- , *The Sayings of Jesus*, New York, 1908.
- , *The Acts of the Apostles*, New York, 1909.
- , *The Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels*, New York, 1911.
- Harrison, P. N., *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, Oxford, 1921.
- Hincks, E. Y., "The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles," in *The Journal of Biblical Literature*, XVI (1897), 94-117.
- Holtzmann, J. H., *Evangelium, Briefe, und Offenbarung des Johanne*, 3te Auf., besorgt von W. Bauer, Tübingen, 1908.
- Howard, W. F., *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*, London, 1931.
- Lake, K., *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2 vols. (in the Loeb Classical Library), New York and London, 1924-1925.
- Lewis, F. Warburton, *Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge, 1910.
- Lightfoot, J. B., *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, London, 1865, 2nd, ed., 1866.
- Lightfoot, R. H., *History and Interpretation of the Gospels*, London, 1935.
- McGiffert, A. C., *The Apostolic Age*, New York, 1898.
- Moffatt, James, "The Revelation of St. John the Divine," in W. R. Nicoll's *Expositor's Greek Testament*, Vol. V, 279-494, New York, 1910.
- , *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, New York, 1908.
- Perry, A. M., *The Sources of St. Luke's Passion-Narrative*, Chicago, 1916.
- Ramsay, W. M., *The Church and the Roman Empire before A.D. 170*, New York, 1893.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE

- Ramsay, W. M., *St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, New York, 1896.
- Ropes, J. H., *The Apostolic Age*, New York, 1906.
- , *The Epistle of St. James in the International Critical Commentary*, New York, 1916.
- , *The Singular Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians*, Cambridge, 1929.
- Sanday, Wm., *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, New York, 1905.
- , *Studies in the Synoptic Problem by Members of Oxford University*, Oxford, 1911.
- Schechter, S., *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1910.
- Scott, E. F., *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, Edinburgh, 1922.
- , *The Fourth Gospel*, Edinburgh, 1906.
- Spitta, F., *Das Johannes Evangelium*, Göttingen, 1910.
- Staunton, V. H., *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Vol. I-III, Cambridge, 1903-1919.
- Strachan, R. H., *The Fourth Evangelist, Dramatist or Historian?*, New York, 1925.
- Streeter, H. B., *The Four Gospels*, New York, 1925.
- , *The Primitive Church*, New York, 1929.
- Swete, H. B., *The Apocalypse of John*, London, 1906.
- Taylor, Vincent, *Behind the Third Gospel*, Oxford, 1926.
- , *The First Draft of St. Luke's Gospel*, London, 1927.
- , *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, London, 1933.
- Torrey, C. C., "The Authorship and Character of the 'so-called' Epistle to the Hebrews," in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXX (1911), 137-157.
- , *The Composition of Acts*, Cambridge, 1916.
- , *The Four Gospels*, New York, 1933.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Wand, J. W. C., *The General Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude*, London, 1934.
- Wellhausen, J., *Erweiterungen und Aenderung im vierten Evangelium*, Berlin, 1907.
- Wendt, W. W., *Das Evangelium Johannis*, Göttingen, 1900.
- , *Die Schichten im vierten Evangelium*, Göttingen, 1911.
- Wickes, D. R., *The Sources of St. Luke's Pereaean Section*, Chicago, 1912.

INDEX

- Agabus, 46
Agrippa I, 41, 45
Agrippa II, 95
Allegory, 70
Ancyra, 52
Andronicus, 84
Annas, 96
Antioch, 31, 49 ff.; in Psidia, 50 f.;
 Christianity reached, 45
Apocalypse of Jesus, 42
Apollos, 70 ff.
Aquila, 66, 69 ff., 76 f., 83 f
Arabia, 23, 28 f.
Aretas, 23, 29
Asia Minor, 50
Augustus, 40
- Bacon, B. W., 63, 114, 149
Baptismal formula, 127, Roman,
 142; Trinitarian, 127
Barnabas, 30 f., 45, 47 ff., 60 f., 64
Baur, F. C., 6, 29
Beckwith, I. T., 149
Bezae Codex, 61
Bibliography, selected, 149-153
Bishops, 112, 142
Briggs, C. A., 133, 149
Bruce, A. B., 149
Bultmann, R., 3, 4, 5, 36, 149
Burton, E. D., 128, 150
- Cadbury, H. J., 100, 102, 109, 150
Caesarea, 22
Caius, 40 ff., *see also* Caligula
Caligula, 44 f.
- Catechists in Galatia, 58
Charles, R. H., 98, 150
Christian, the name, 45
Christianity, Jewish, 39
Christianity, Jewish sect, 16
Chronology, 147-148
Church, 138, 146
Cilicia, 30, 60
Claudius, 42, 44 f., 83
Communism, 16
Corinth, 66
Corinthian Epistles, 78 ff.
Credner, K., 106
Creed, J. M., 150
- Damascus, 23 ff., 28 ff.
Deacons, Order of, 18
De Boor, 97
Deissmann, A., 69, 76
Delphi, Inscription at, 69
Derbe, 50 f., 52
Dibelius, Martin, 3, 4, 5, 150
Dobschutz, E. von, 150
Domitian, 44
Drummond, J., 150
Duncan, G. S., 76
- Easton, B. S., 5, 37, 109, 150
Ebionites, 112
Emmet, Cyril, 47
Enslin, M. S., 3
Epaphroditus, 76
Ephesians, Epistle to, 122 f.
Ephesus, 69 f., 74
Eusebius, 63, 96, 100, 135, 144, 150
Everett C. C., 27, 150

INDEX

- Famine, 46
 Fascher, E., 150
 Festus, 88, 95 f.
 Foakes-Jackson, F. J., 5, 39, 108, 150
 Form-criticism, 2, 33
Formgeschichte, 2, 33
 Fourth Gospel, 135
- Galatia, 51, 70; catechists in, 58;
 churches of, 50 f.
 Galatian theory, 52
 Galatians, Epistle to, 53 f., 56 f.
 Gallio, 68
 Garvie, A., 150
 Glossolalia, 9 ff.
 Goguel, M., 76
 Goodspeed, E. J., 108, 124, 150
 Gospel stories, 33
 Gospel to the Gentiles, 47
 Grant, F. C., 3, 151
- Harnack, A., von, 105-108, 111, 151
 Harrison, P. N., 141, 151
 Hebrews, Epistle to, 115
 Hellenists, 17, 18
 Herod Agrippa *see* Agrippa
 Hincks, E. Y., 141, 151
 Holtzmann, J. H., 151
 Holy Spirit, 15
 Howard, W. F., 151
- Iconium, 50 ff.
 Ignatius of Antioch, 139, 141, 142
- James, Epistle of, 143
 James, the Lord's brother, 47 f., 96
 James, the son of Zebedee, 45
 Jerusalem, 16, 29-31, 70; Mother
 church at, 71, 85 f., 95; Synod or
 council of, 49 A. D., 60
 Jews, preaching to, 34
 John the Baptist, birth of, 73
 John the Baptist, sect of, 70, 73, 137
 John, Gospel of, 135 ff.
- John, the son of Zebedee, 48 f., 96-
 97
 Joppa, 22
 Josephus, 40, 46, 96-97, 109-111
 Judas, 61
 Jude, Epistle of, 144
 Junius, 84
- Keim, T., 109
 Krenkel, M., 109-110
- Lake, Kirsopp, 5, 11-12, 39, 46, 51,
 83, 100, 108, 151
 Lewis, F. W., 151
 Lightfoot, J. B., 28, 52, 151
 Lightfoot, R. H., 5, 151
 Luke, 65-66, 103-104, 112
 Luke, Gospel of, 113 f.
 Lutgert, W., 54
 Lycaonia 51
 Lydda 22
 Lystra, 50 ff.
- M (Document), 85, 128, 130
 Mark, Gospel of, 114
 Mark, John, 3, 49, 61 f., 64
 Matthew, Gospel of, 127 ff.
 McGiffert, A. C., 151
 Mission, Christian, 22
 Missionary journeys: the first, 49;
 the second, 65 ff.; the third, 70
 Moffatt, J., 126, 145, 151
 Mother church at Jerusalem, 71,
 85 f., 95
 Mystery religions, 137
 Mystic group experience, 10 ff.
- Nazarenes, 112
 Nero, 83, 98 f.
- Ott, J. B., 109
- Papias, 39, 97
 Parables, 37
 Parallelism, 37

INDEX

- Passion, accounts of, 35
 Pastoral Epistles, 141
 Paul, 19 ff., 23-26, 28, 30, 46 ff., 55,
 60 ff., 65, 74, 76 f., 85; conversion,
 23 ff.; 1st missionary journey, 49;
 2nd missionary journey, 65 ff.;
 3rd missionary journey, 70; vi-
 sion near Damascus, 25 f.
 Peake, Arthur, 98
 Pentecost, Day of, 9 ff.
Perfecti, 80
 Periods of the Apostolic Age, 6
 Perry, A. M., 151
 Persecution of Christians, 21; by
 Nero, 100 ff.
 Pessinus, 52
 Peter, 11, 16, 30, 48 f., 79, 98, 100,
 120, 125, 127, 132
 Peter, Epistles of, 124 f., 145
 Petronius, 40 ff.
 Philemon, 76
 Philip, 22
 Philo, 70-72
 Phoebe, 84
 Phrygia, 51
Pneumatici, 55
 Preaching to Jews, 34
 Presbyters, 50
 Priscilla, 66, 69-71, 76-77, 83-84
 Pronouncement stories, 35
 Prophecy, 13 f.
 Psychic phenomena at Pentecost, 11

 Q (Document), 58, 63, 128

 Ramsay, W. M., 52, 65-66, 100, 106,
 118, 125, 151, 152
 Resurrection, 35
 Revelation, Book of, 44, 98, 132, 134
 Romans, Epistle to the, 84 f.
 Ropes, J. H., 54, 143, 152
 Rosché, R. H., 128

 Samaria, 22

 Sanday, W., 152
 Saul of Tarsus *see* Paul
 Schechter, S., 23, 152
 Schoene, A., 100
 Schweitzer, A., 43
 Scott, E. F., 152
 Shrader, Paul, 106
 Silas, 61, 65-66; *see also* Silvanus
 Silvanus, 126; *see also* Silas
 Spitta, F., 11, 105-106, 152
 Staunton, V. H., 152
 Stephen, 18 f., 21 f., 25, 96
 Strachan, R. H., 152
 Streeter, H. B., 125, 128, 140, 152
 Swete, H. B., 152
 Synod, 31
 Syria, 30 f., 60

 Tavium, 52
 Taylor, V., 5, 35, 37, 152
 Temptation, 38
 Ten Commandments, 56
 Timothy, 65-66
 Timothy, Epistles to, 141
 Titus, 48, 80
 Titus, Epistle to, 141
 Tongues, speaking with, 9 ff.
 Torrey, C. C., 109, 152
 Transfiguration, 38
 Trinitarian baptismal formula, 127
 Trinity, 15
 Troas, 65

 Virgin Mary, 74

 Wand, J. W. C., 153
 Weiss, J., 43
 Wellhausen, J., 153
 Wendt, W. W., 153
 Wickes, D. R., 153
 Windisch, H., 5
 Worcester, Elwood, 72

 Zadokites, 23

